

The
American Historical Review

SOCIAL FORCES IN AMERICAN HISTORY¹

THE transformations through which the United States is passing in our own day are so profound, so far-reaching, that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that we are witnessing the birth of a new nation in America. The revolution in the social and economic structure of this country during the past two decades is comparable to what occurred when independence was declared and the Constitution was formed, or to the changes wrought by the era which began half a century ago, the era of Civil War and Reconstruction.

These changes have been long in preparation and are, in part, the result of world-wide forces of reorganization incident to the age of steam production and large-scale industry, and, in part, the result of the closing of the period of the colonization of the West. They have been prophesied, and the course of the movement partly described, by students of American development; but after all, it is with a shock that the people of the United States are coming to realize that the fundamental forces which have shaped their society up to the present are disappearing. Twenty years ago, as I have before had occasion to point out, the Superintendent of the Census declared that the frontier line, which its maps had depicted for decade after decade of the westward march of the nation, could no longer be described. To-day we must add that the age of free competition of individuals for the unpossessed resources of the nation is nearing its end. It is taking less than a generation to write the chapter which began with the disappearance of the line of the frontier—the last chapter in the history of the colonization of the United States, the conclusion to the annals of its pioneer democracy.

It is a wonderful chapter, this final rush of American energy upon the remaining wilderness. Even the bare statistics become eloquent of a new era. They no longer derive their significance from

¹Annual address of the president of the American Historical Association, delivered at Indianapolis, December 28, 1910.

the exhibit of vast portions of the public domain transferred to agriculture, of wildernesses equal to European nations changed decade after decade into the farm area of the United States. It is true there was added to the farms of the nation between 1870 and 1880 a territory equal to that of France, and between 1880 and 1900 a territory equal to the European area of France, Germany, England, and Wales combined. The records for 1910 are not yet available, but whatever they reveal they will not be so full of meaning as the figures which tell of upleaping wealth and organization and concentration of industrial power in the East in the last decade. As the final provinces of the Western empire have been subdued to the purposes of civilization and have yielded their spoils, as the spheres of operation of the great industrial corporations have extended, with the extension of American settlement, production and wealth have increased beyond all precedent.

The total deposits in all national banks have more than trebled in the present decade; the money in circulation has doubled since 1890. The flood of gold makes it difficult to gauge the full meaning of the incredible increase in values, for in the decade ending with 1909 over 41,600,000 ounces of gold were mined in the United States alone. Over four million ounces have been produced every year since 1905, whereas between 1880 and 1894 no year showed a production of two million ounces. As a result of this swelling stream of gold, aided by a variety of other causes, prices have risen until their height has become one of the most marked features and influential factors in American life, producing social readjustments and contributing effectively to party revolutions.

But if we avoid those statistics which require analysis because of the changing standard of value, we still find that the decade occupies an exceptional place in American history. More coal was mined in the United States in the ten years after 1897 than in all the life of the nation before that time.² Fifty years ago we mined less than fifteen million long tons of coal. In 1907 we mined nearly 429,000,000. At the present rate it is estimated that the supply of coal would be exhausted at a date no farther in the future than the formation of the Constitution is in the past. Iron and coal are the measures of industrial power. The nation has produced three times as much iron ore in the past two decades as in all its previous history; the production of the past ten years was more than double that of the prior decade. Pig-iron production is admitted to be an excellent barometer of manufacture and of transportation. Never until 1898

² Van Hise, *Conservation of Natural Resources*, pp. 23, 24.

had this reached an annual total of ten million long tons. But in the five years beginning with 1904 it averaged over twice that. By 1907 the United States had surpassed Great Britain, Germany, and France combined in the production of pig-iron and steel together, and in the same decade a single great corporation has established its domination over the iron mines and steel manufacture of the United States. It is more than a mere accident that the United States Steel Corporation with its stocks and bonds aggregating \$1,400,000,000 was organized at the beginning of the present decade. The former wilderness about Lake Superior has, principally in the past two decades, established its position as overwhelmingly the preponderant source of iron ore, present and prospective, in the United States—a treasury from which Pittsburg has drawn wealth and extended its unparalleled industrial empire in these years. The tremendous energies thus liberated at this centre of industrial power in the United States revolutionized methods of manufacture in general, and in many indirect ways profoundly influenced the life of the nation.

Railroad statistics tell the same story of unprecedented development, the formation of a new industrial society. The number of passengers carried one mile more than doubled between 1890 and 1908; freight carried one mile has nearly trebled in the same period and has doubled in the past decade. Agricultural products tell a different story. The corn crop has only risen from about two billion bushels in 1891 to two and seven-tenths billions in 1909; wheat from six hundred and eleven million bushels in 1891 to only seven hundred and thirty-seven million in 1909, and cotton from about nine million bales in 1891 to ten and three-tenths million bales in 1909. Population has increased in the United States proper from about sixty-two and one-half millions in 1890 to seventy-five and one-half millions in 1900 and to about ninety millions in 1910.

It is clear from these statistics that the ratio of the nation's increased production of immediate wealth by the enormously increased exploitation of its remaining natural resources vastly exceeds the ratio of increase of population and still more strikingly exceeds the ratio of increase of agricultural products. Already population is pressing upon the food supply while capital consolidates in billion-dollar organizations. The "Triumphant Democracy" whose achievements the iron-master celebrated has reached a stature even more imposing than he could have foreseen; but still less did he perceive the changes in democracy itself and the conditions of its life which have accompanied this material growth.

Having colonized the Far West, having mastered its internal

resources, the nation turned at the conclusion of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century to deal with the Far East, to engage in the world-politics of the Pacific Ocean. Having brought to its logical conclusion its long continued expansion into the lands of the old Spanish empire by the successful outcome of the recent war, the United States became the mistress of the Philippines at the same time that it came into possession of the Hawaiian Islands, and the controlling influence in the Gulf of Mexico. It provided early in the present decade for connecting its Atlantic and Pacific coasts by the Isthmian Canal, and became an imperial republic with dependencies and protectorates—admittedly a new world-power, with a voice potential in the problems of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

This extension of power and undertaking of grave responsibilities in new fields, this entry into the sisterhood of world-states, was no unrelated event. It was, indeed, in some respects the logical outcome of the nation's march to the Pacific, the sequence to the era in which it was engaged in occupying the free lands and exploiting the resources of the West. When it had achieved this position among the nations of the earth, the United States found itself confronted, also, with the need of constitutional readjustment, arising from the relations of federal government and territorial acquisitions. It was obliged to reconsider questions of the rights of man and traditional American ideals of liberty and democracy, in view of the task of government of other races politically inexperienced and undeveloped.

When we turn to consider the effect upon American society and domestic policy in these two decades of transition we are met with palpable evidences of the invasion of the old pioneer democratic order. Obvious among them is the effect of unprecedented immigration to supply the mobile army of cheap labor for the centres of industrial life. In the past ten years, beginning with 1900, over eight million immigrants have arrived. The newcomers of the eight years since 1900 would, according to a writer in 1908, "repopulate all the five older New England States as they stand to-day; or, if properly disseminated over the newer parts of the country they would serve to populate no less than nineteen states of the union as they stand". In 1907 "there were one and one-quarter million arrivals. This number would entirely populate both New Hampshire and Maine, two of our oldest states." "The arrivals of this one year would found a state with more inhabitants than any one of twenty-one of our other existing commonwealths which could be named." Not only has the addition to the population from

Europe been thus extraordinary, it has come in increasing measure from southern and eastern Europe. For the year 1907, Professor Ripley,³ whom I am quoting, has redistributed the incomers on the basis of physical type and finds that one-quarter of them were of the Mediterranean race, one-quarter of the Slavic race, one-eighth Jewish, and only one-sixth of the Alpine, and one-sixth of the Teutonic. In 1882 Germans had come to the amount of 250,000; in 1907 they were replaced by 330,000 South Italians. Thus it is evident that the ethnic elements of the United States have undergone startling changes; and instead of spreading over the nation these immigrants have concentrated especially in the cities and great industrial centres in the past decade. The composition of the labor class and its relation to wages and to the native American employer have been deeply influenced thereby; the element of sympathy with labor has been unfavorably affected by the pressure of great numbers of immigrants of alien nationality and of lower standards of life.

The familiar facts of the massing of population in the cities and contemporaneous increase of urban power, and of the massing of capital and production in fewer and vastly greater economic units, especially attest the revolution. "It is a proposition too plain to require elucidation", wrote Richard Rush, Secretary of the Treasury, in his report of 1827, "that the creation of capital is retarded rather than accelerated by the diffusion of a thin population over a great surface of soil." Thirty years earlier Albert Gallatin declared in Congress that "if the cause of the happiness of this country were examined into, it would be found to arise as much from the great plenty of land in proportion to the inhabitants which their citizens enjoyed as from the wisdom of their political institutions." Possibly both of these Pennsylvania financiers were right under the conditions of the time; but it is at least significant that capital and labor entered upon a new era as the end of the free lands approached. A contemporary of Gallatin in Congress had replied to the argument that cheap lands would depopulate the Atlantic coast by saying that if a law were framed to prevent ready access to western lands it would be tantamount to saying that there is some class which must remain "and by law be obliged to serve the others for such wages as they pleased to give". The passage of the arable public domain into private possession has raised this question in a new form and has brought forth new answers. This is peculiarly the era when competitive individualism in the midst of vast unappropriated opportunities changed into monopoly, by huge aggregations of capital, of

³ *Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1908, CII. 745.

the fundamental industrial processes as the free lands disappeared. All the tendencies of the large-scale production of the twentieth century, all of the energies of the age of steam, found in America exceptional freedom of action and were offered regions of activity equal to the states of all western Europe. Here they reached their highest development.

The decade following 1907 is marked by the work of Mr. Harriman and his rivals in building up the various railroads into a few great groups, a process that had gone so far that before his death Mr. Harriman was ambitious to concentrate them all under his single control. High finance under the leadership of Mr. Morgan has steadily achieved the consolidation of the greater industries into trusts or combinations and has effected a community of interests between them and a few dominant banking organizations, with allied insurance companies and trust companies. In New York City have been centred as never before the banking reserves of the nation, and here by the financial management of capital and speculative promotion there has grown up a unified control over the nation's industrial life. Colossal private fortunes have arisen. No longer is the per capita wealth of the nation a real index to the prosperity of the average man. Labor on the other hand has shown an increasing self-consciousness, is combining and increasing its demands. In a word, the old pioneer individualism is disappearing, while the forces of social combination are manifesting themselves as never before. The self-made man has become, in popular speech, the coal baron, the steel king, the oil king, the cattle king, the railroad magnate, the master of high finance, the monarch of trusts. The world has never before seen such huge fortunes exercising combined control over the economic life of a people, and such luxury as has come out of the individualistic pioneer democracy of America in the course of its competitive evolution.

At the same time the masters of industry, who control interests which represent billions of dollars, do not admit that they have broken with pioneer ideals. They regard themselves as pioneers under changed conditions, carrying on the old work of developing the natural resources of the nation, compelled by the constructive fever in their veins, even in ill-health and old age and after the accumulation of wealth beyond their power to enjoy, to seek new avenues of action and of power, to chop new clearings, to find new trails, to expand the horizon of the nation's activity, and to extend the scope of their dominion. "This country", said the late Mr. Harriman in an interview a few years ago, "has been developed by

a wonderful people, flush with enthusiasm, imagination and speculative bent. . . . They have been magnificent pioneers. They saw into the future and adapted their work to the possibilities. . . . Stifle that enthusiasm, deaden that imagination and prohibit that speculation by restrictive and cramping conservative law, and you tend to produce a moribund and conservative people and country." This is an appeal to the historic ideals of Americans who viewed the republic as the guardian of individual freedom to compete for the control of the natural resources of the nation.

On the other hand, we have the voice of the insurgent West, recently given utterance in the New Nationalism of ex-President Roosevelt, demanding increase of federal authority to curb the special interests, the powerful industrial organizations, and the monopolies, for the sake of the conservation of our natural resources and the preservation of American democracy.

The past decade has witnessed an extraordinary federal activity in limiting individual and corporate freedom for the benefit of society. To that decade belong the Conservation Congresses and the effective organization of the Forest Service, and the Reclamation Service. Taken together these developments alone would mark a new era, for over three hundred million acres are, as a result of this policy, reserved from entry and sale, an area more than equal to that of all the states which established the Constitution, if we exclude their western claims; and these reserved lands are held for a more beneficial use of their forests, minerals, arid tracts, and water rights, by the nation as a whole. Another example is the extension of the activity of the Department of Agriculture, which seeks the remotest regions of the earth for crops suitable to the areas reclaimed by the government, maps and analyzes the soils, fosters the improvement of seeds and animals, tells the farmer when and how and what to plant, and makes war upon diseases of plants and animals and insect pests. The recent legislation for pure food and meat inspection, and the whole mass of regulative law under the Interstate Commerce Clause of the Constitution, further illustrate the same tendency.

Two ideals were fundamental in traditional American thought, ideals that developed in the pioneer era. One was the ideal of individual freedom to compete unrestrictedly for the resources of a continent—the squatter ideal. The other was the ideal of a democracy—"government of the people, by the people and for the people". The operation of these ideals took place contemporaneously with the passing into private possession of the free public domain and the

natural resources of the United States. But American democracy was based on free lands; these were the very conditions that shaped its growth and its fundamental traits. Thus time has revealed that these two ideals of pioneer democracy had elements of mutual hostility and contained the seeds of its dissolution. The present finds itself engaged in the task of readjusting its old ideals to new conditions and is turning increasingly to government to safeguard its traditional democracy. It is not surprising that socialism shows noteworthy gains as elections continue; that parties are forming on new lines; that the demand for primary elections, for popular choice of senators, initiative, referendum, and recall, is spreading, and that the regions once the centre of pioneer democracy exhibit these tendencies in the most marked degree. They are efforts to find substitutes for that former safeguard of democracy, the disappearing free lands. They are the sequence to the extinction of the frontier.

It is necessary next to notice that in the midst of all this national energy, and contemporaneous with the tendency to turn to the national government for protection to democracy, there is clear evidence of the persistence and the development of sectionalism. Whether we observe the grouping of votes in Congress and in general elections, or the organization and utterances of business leaders, or the association of scholars, churches, or other representatives of the things of the spirit, we find that American life is not only increasing in its national intensity but that it is integrating by sections. In part this is due to the factor of great spaces which make sectional rather than national organization the line of least resistance; but, in part, it is also the expression of the separate economic, political, and social interests and the separate spiritual life of the various geographic provinces or sections. The votes on the tariff, and in general the location of the strongholds of the Progressive Republican movement, illustrate this fact. The difficulty of adjusting railway rates to the diverse interests of different sections is another example. Whether the South should be supplied with salt from Kansas or from Michigan, whether Chicago and its tributary prairie areas should be supplied with lumber from the far Northwest, from Louisiana, or from some other area, depends upon the settlement of rates and involves adjudication by federal authorities, who are forced to recognize sectional interests. Without attempting to enter upon a more extensive discussion of sectionalism, I desire simply to point out that there are evidences that now, as formerly, the separate geographical interests have their leaders and spokesmen, that much Congressional legislation is determined by the contests, triumphs, or

compromises between the rival sections, and that the real federal relations of the United States seem likely to be shaped by the interplay of sectional with national forces rather than by the relation of state and nation. As time goes on and the nation adjusts itself more durably to the conditions of the differing geographic sections which make it up, they are coming to a new self-consciousness and a revived self-assertion. Our national character is a composite of these sections.

Obviously in attempting to indicate even a portion of the significant features of our recent history we have been obliged to take note of a complex of forces. The times are so close at hand that the relations between events and tendencies force themselves upon our attention. We must deal with the connections of geography, industrial growth, politics, and government. With these we must take into consideration the changing social composition, the inherited beliefs and habitual attitude of the masses of the people, the psychology of the nation and of the separate sections, as well as of the leaders. We must see how these leaders are shaped partly by their time and section, and how they are in part original, creative, by virtue of their own genius and initiative. We cannot neglect the moral tendencies and the ideals. All are related parts of the same subject and can no more be properly understood in isolation than the movement as a whole can be understood by neglecting some of these important factors, or by the use of a single method of investigation. Whatever be the truth regarding European history, American history is chiefly concerned with social forces, shaping and reshaping under the conditions of a nation changing as it adjusts to its environment. And this environment progressively reveals new aspects of itself, exerts new influences, and calls out new social organs and functions.

I have undertaken this rapid survey of recent history for two purposes. First, because it has seemed fitting to emphasize the significance of American development since the passing of the frontier, and, second, because in the observation of present conditions we may find assistance in our study of the past.

It is a familiar doctrine that each age studies its history anew and with interests determined by the spirit of the time. Each age finds it necessary to reconsider at least some portions of the past, from points of view furnished by new conditions which reveal the influence and significance of forces not adequately known by the historians of the previous generation. Unquestionably each investigator and writer is influenced by the times in which he lives and

while this fact exposes the historian to a bias, at the same time it affords him new instruments and new insight for dealing with his subject.

If recent history, then, gives new meaning to past events, if it has to deal with the rise into a commanding position of forces, the origin and growth of which may have been inadequately described or even overlooked by historians of the previous generation, it is important to study the present and the recent past, not only for themselves but also as the source of new hypotheses, new lines of inquiry, new criteria of the perspective of the remoter past. And, moreover, a just public opinion and a statesmanlike treatment of present problems demand that they be seen in their historical relations in order that history may hold the lamp for conservative reform.

Seen from the vantage-ground of present developments what new light falls upon past events! When we consider what the Mississippi Valley has come to be in American life, and when we consider what it is yet to be, the young Washington, crossing the snows of the wilderness to summon the French to evacuate the portals of the great valley, becomes the herald of an empire. When we recall the titanic industrial power that has centred at Pittsburg, Braddock's advance to the forks of the Ohio takes on new meaning. "Carving a cross on the wilderness rim", even in defeat, he opened a road to what is now the centre of the world's industrial energy. The modifications which England proposed in 1794 to John Jay in the northwestern boundary of the United States from the Lake of the Woods to the Mississippi, seemed, doubtless, to him significant chiefly as a matter of principle and as a question of the retention or loss of beaver grounds. The historians hardly notice the proposals. But they involved, in fact, the ownership of the richest and most extensive deposits of iron ore in America, the all-important source of a fundamental industry of the United States, the occasion for the rise of some of the most influential forces of our time.

What continuity and meaning are furnished by the outcome in present times of the movements of minor political parties and reform agitations! To the historian they have often seemed to be mere curious side eddies, vexatious distractions to the course of his literary craft as it navigated the stream of historical tendency. And yet, by the revelation of the present, what seemed to be side eddies have not seldom proven to be the concealed entrances to the main current, and the course which seemed the central one has led to blind channels and stagnant waters, important in their day, but cut off like ox-bow lakes from the mighty river of historical progress by

the more permanent and compelling forces of the neglected currents.

We may trace the contest between the capitalist and the democratic pioneer from the earliest colonial days. It is influential in colonial parties. It is seen in the vehement protests of Kentucky frontiersmen in petition after petition to the Congress of the Confederation against the "nabobs" and men of wealth who took out titles to the pioneers' farms while they themselves were too busy defending those farms from the Indians to perfect their claims. It is seen in the attitude of the Ohio Valley in its backwoods days before the rise of the Whig party, as when in 1811 Henry Clay denounced the Bank of the United States as a corporation which thrived on special privileges—"a splendid association of favored individuals taken from the mass of society, and invested with exemptions and surrounded by immunities and privileges". Benton voiced the same contest twenty years later when he denounced the bank as

a company of private individuals, many of them foreigners, and the mass of them residing in a remote and narrow corner of the Union, unconnected by any sympathy with the fertile regions of the Great Valley in which the natural power of this Union, the power of numbers, will be found to reside long before the renewed term of the second charter would expire.

"And where", he asked, "would all this power and money centre? In the great cities of the Northeast, which have been for forty years and that by force of federal legislation, the lion's den of Southern and Western money—that den into which all the tracks point inward; from which the returning track of a solitary dollar has never yet been seen." Declaring, in words that have a very modern sound, that the bank tended to multiply nabobs and paupers, and that "a great moneyed power is favorable to great capitalists, for it is the principle of capital to favor capital", he appealed to the fact of the country's extent and its sectional divergences against the nationalizing of capital.

What a condition for a confederacy of states! What grounds for alarm and terrible apprehension when in a confederacy of such vast extent, so many rival commercial cities, so much sectional jealousy, such violent political parties, such fierce contests for power, there should be but one moneyed tribunal before which all the rival and contending elements must appear.

Even more vehement were the words of Jackson in 1837. "It is now plain", he wrote, "that the war is to be carried on by the monied aristocracy of the few against the democracy of numbers; the [prosperous] to make the honest laborers hewers of wood and drawers of water through the credit and paper system."

Van Buren's administration is usually passed hastily over with hardly more than mention of his Independent Treasury plan, and with particular consideration of the slavery discussions. But some of the most important movements in American social and political history began in these years of Jackson and Van Buren. Read the demands of the obscure labor papers and the reports of labor's open-air meetings anew, and you shall find in the utterances of so-called labor visionaries and the locofoco champions of "equal rights for all and special privileges for none", like Evans and Jacques, Byrdsall and Leggett, the finger points to the currents that now make the main channel of our history; you shall find in them some of the important planks of the platforms of the triumphant parties of our own day. As Professor Commons has shown by his papers and the documents which he has published on labor history, an idealistic but widespread and influential humanitarian movement, strikingly similar to that of the present, arose in the years between 1830 and 1850, dealing with social forces in American life, animated by a desire to apply the public lands to social amelioration, eager to find new forms of democratic development. But the flood of the slavery struggle swept all of these movements into its mighty inundation for the time. After the war, other influences delayed the revival of the movement. The railroads opened the vast prairies after 1850 and made it easy to reach them; and decade after decade new sections were reduced to the purposes of civilization and to the advantages of the common man as well as the promotion of great individual fortunes. The nation centred its interests in the development of the West. It is only in our own day that this humanitarian democratic wave has reached the level of those earlier years. But in the meantime there are clear evidences of the persistence of the forces, even though under strange guise. Read the platforms of the Greenback-Labor, the Granger, and the Populist parties, and you will find in those platforms, discredited and reprobated by the major parties of the time, the basic proposals of the Democratic party after its revolution under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, and of the Republican party after its revolution by Mr. Roosevelt. The Insurgent movement is so clearly related to the areas and elements that gave strength to this progressive assertion of old democratic ideals with new weapons, that it must be regarded as the organized refusal of these persistent tendencies to be checked by the advocates of more moderate measures.

I have dealt with these fragments of party history, not, of course, with the purpose of expressing any present judgment upon them, but

to emphasize and give concreteness to the fact that there is disclosed by present events a new significance to these contests of radical democracy and conservative interests; that they are rather a continuing expression of deep-seated forces than fragmentary and sporadic curios for the historical museum.

If we should survey the history of our lands from a similar point of view, considering the relations of legislation and administration of the public domain to the structure of American democracy, it would yield a return far beyond that offered by the formal treatment of the subject in most of our histories. We should find in the squatter doctrines and practices, the seizure of the best soils, the taking of public timber on the theory of a right to it by the labor expended on it, fruitful material for understanding the atmosphere and ideals under which the great corporations developed the West. Men like Senator Benton and Delegate Sibley in successive generations defended the trespasses of the pioneer and the lumberman upon the public forest lands, and denounced the paternal government that "harassed" these men, who were engaged in what we should call stealing government timber. It is evident that at some time between the middle of the nineteenth century and the present time, when we impose jail sentences upon Congressmen caught in such violations of the land laws, a change came over the American conscience and the civic ideals were modified. That our great industrial enterprises developed in the midst of these changing ideals is important to recall when we write the history of their activity.

We should find also that we cannot understand the land question without seeing its relations to the struggle of sections and classes bidding against each other and finding in the public domain a most important topic of political bargaining. We should find, too, that the settlement of unlike geographic areas in the course of the nation's progress resulted in changes in the effect of the land laws, that a system intended for the humid prairies was ill-adjusted to the arid lands and coal fields and to the forests in the days of large-scale exploitation by corporations commanding great capital. Thus changing geographic factors as well as the changing character of the forces which occupied the public domain must be considered, if we would understand the bearing of legislation and policy in this field. It is fortunate that suggestive studies of democracy and the land policy have already begun to appear.

The whole subject of American agriculture viewed in relation to the economic, political, and social life of the nation has important contributions to make. If for example we study the maps showing

the transition of the wheat belt from the East to the West, as the virgin soils were conquered and made new bases for destructive competition with the older wheat states, we shall see how deeply they affected not only land values, railroad building, the movement of population, and the supply of cheap food, but also how the regions once devoted to single cropping of wheat were forced to turn to varied and intensive agriculture and to diversified industry, and we shall see also how these transformations affected party politics and even the ideals of the Americans of the regions thus changed. We shall find in the over-production of wheat in the provinces thus rapidly colonized, and in the over-production of silver in the mountain provinces which were contemporaneously exploited, important explanations of the peculiar form which American politics took in the period when Mr. Bryan mastered the Democratic party, just as we shall find in the opening of the new gold fields in the years immediately following, and in the passing of the era of almost free virgin wheat soils, explanations of the more recent period when high prices are giving new energy and aggressiveness to the demands of American democracy.

Enough has been said, it may be assumed, to make clear the point which I am trying to elucidate, namely that a comprehension of the United States of to-day, an understanding of the rise and progress of the forces which have made it what it was, demands that we should rework our history from the new points of view afforded by the present. If this is done, it will be seen that the progress of the struggle between North and South over slavery and the freed negro, which held the principal place in American interest in the two decades after 1850, was, after all, only one of the interests of the time. The pages of the Congressional debates, the contemporary newspapers, the public documents of those twenty years, remain a rich mine for those who will seek therein the sources of movements dominant in the present day.

The final consideration to which I ask your attention in this discussion of social forces in American life, is with reference to the mode of investigating them and the bearing of these investigations upon the relations and the goal of history. It has become a precedent, fairly well established by the distinguished scholars who have filled the office which I am about to lay down, to state a position with reference to the relations of history and its sister-studies, and even to raise the question of the attitude of the historian toward the laws of thermodynamics and to seek to find the key of historical development or of historical degradation. It is not given to all to bend the bow of Ulysses. I shall attempt a lesser task.

We may take some lessons from the scientist. Like the historian the scientist has learned that many of his fundamental assumptions are imperfect or false. He has enriched knowledge especially in recent years by attacking the no-man's lands left unexplored by the too sharp delimitation of spheres of activity. These new conquests have been especially achieved by the combination of old sciences. Physical chemistry, electro-chemistry, geo-physics, astro-physics, and a variety of other scientific unions have led to audacious hypotheses, veritable flashes of vision, which open new regions of activity for a generation of investigators. Moreover they have promoted such investigations by furnishing new instruments of research. Now in some respects this is an analogy between geology and history. The new geologist aims to explain the inorganic earth dynamically in terms of natural law, using chemistry, physics, mathematics, and even botany and zoology so far as they relate to paleontology. He does not insist that the relative importance of physical or chemical factors shall be determined before he applies the methods and data of these sciences to his problem. Indeed, he has learned that a geological area is too complex a thing to be reduced to a single explanation. He has abandoned the single hypothesis for the multiple hypothesis. He creates a whole family of possible explanations of a given problem and thus avoids the warping influence of partiality for a simple theory.

Have we not here an illustration of what is possible and necessary for the historian? Is it not well, before attempting to decide whether history requires an economic interpretation or a psychological, or any other ultimate interpretation, to recognize that the factors in human society are varied and complex; that the political historian handling his subject in isolation is certain to miss fundamental facts and relations in his treatment of a given age or nation; that the economic historian is exposed to the same danger; and so of all of the other special historians?

Those who insist that history is simply the effort to tell the thing exactly as it was, to state the facts, are confronted with the difficulty that the fact which they would represent is not planted on the solid ground of fixed conditions; it is in the midst and is itself a part of the changing currents, the interacting influences of the time, deriving its significance as a fact from its relations to the deeper-seated movements of the age, movements so gradual that often only the passing years can reveal the truth about the fact and its right to a place on the historian's page.

The economic historian is in danger of making his analysis and

his statement of a law on the basis of present conditions and then passing to history for justificatory appendixes to his conclusions. An American economist of high rank has recently expressed his conception of "the full relation of economic theory, statistics, and history" in these words:

A principle is formulated by *a priori* reasoning concerning facts of common experience; it is then tested by statistics and promoted to the rank of a known and acknowledged truth; illustrations of its action are then found in narrative history and, on the other hand, the economic law becomes the interpreter of records that would otherwise be confusing and comparatively valueless; the law itself derives its final confirmation from the illustrations of its working which the records afford; but what is at least of equal importance is the parallel fact that the law affords the decisive test of the correctness of those assertions concerning the causes and the effects of past events which it is second nature to make and which historians almost invariably do make in connection with their narrations.*

There is much in this statement by which the historian may profit, but he may doubt also whether the past should serve merely as the "illustration" by which to confirm the law deduced from common experience by *a priori* reasoning tested by statistics. In fact the pathway of history is strewn with the wrecks of the "known and acknowledged truths" of economic law, due not only to defective analysis and imperfect statistics, but also to the lack of critical historical methods, to insufficient historical-mindedness on the part of the economist, to failure to give due attention to the relativity and transiency of the conditions from which his laws were deduced.

But the point on which I would lay stress is this. The economist, the political scientist, the psychologist, the sociologist, the geographer, the students of literature, of art, of religion—all the allied laborers in the study of society—have contributions to make to the equipment of the historian. These contributions are partly of material, partly of tools, partly of new points of view, new hypotheses, new suggestions of relations, causes, and emphasis. Each of these special students is in some danger of bias by his particular point of view, by his exposure to see simply the thing in which he is primarily interested, and also by his effort to deduce the universal laws of his separate science. The historian, on the other hand, is exposed to the danger of dealing with the complex and interacting social forces of a period or of a country, from some single point of view to which his special training or interest inclines him. If the truth is to be made known, the historian must so far familiarize

* Professor J. B. Clark, in Commons, ed., *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, I. 43-44.

himself with the work, and equip himself with the training of his sister-subjects that he can at least avail himself of their results and in some reasonable degree master the essential tools of their trade. And the followers of the sister-studies must likewise familiarize themselves and their students with the work and the methods of the historians, and co-operate in the difficult task.

It is necessary that the American historian shall aim at this equipment, not so much that he may possess the key to history or satisfy himself in regard to its ultimate laws. At present a different duty is before him. He must see in American society with its vast spaces, its sections equal to European nations, its geographic influences, its brief period of development, its variety of nationalities and races, its extraordinary industrial growth under the conditions of freedom, its institutions, culture, ideals, social psychology, and even its religions, forming and changing almost under his eyes, one of the richest fields ever offered for the preliminary recognition and study of the forces that operate and interplay in the making of society.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

THE ROMAN LAW AND THE GERMAN PEASANT¹

ONE of the most curious and interesting facts in legal history is the introduction or "Reception" of the Roman law into Germany in the course of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries.² Students of the new law began to find places as town-clerks or as councillors of princes, and, as such, eventually had opportunities to apply their legal knowledge in a practical way. Professors of law were frequently asked to act as arbitrators; and more important cases were often taken for advice or decision to the law faculties of the universities. The invention of printing made easy the multiplication of the works of the Italian commentators, and of popular handbooks, written by Germans, but based more or less on the medieval feudalized Roman law which was being actually applied and discussed in Italy.³ The Reception of the Roman Law was greatly furthered by the establishment of the *Reichskammergericht* in 1495. Eight at least of its sixteen judges were to be men "learned in the (Roman) law". Many causes brought it about that this imperial court inclined to judge according to Roman rather than German laws. In the sixteenth century, partly under the influence of this imperial court, similar, more or less Romanizing, supreme courts (*Hofgerichte*, *Kammergerichte*, *Kanzleien*) were created in many of the German territories. Roman legal ideas gradually filtered down from the higher to the lower courts, or were incorporated to a greater or less degree in the numerous codifications of law made by princes and cities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

¹ A summary of this article was read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in New York in December, 1909.

² For brief text-book accounts of the Reception, with bibliographies, cf. B. Windscheid, *Lehrbuch des Pandektenrechts* (ninth ed., Frankfort, 1906), I. 1-8; H. Brunner, *Grundzüge der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (third ed., Leipzig, 1908), pp. 244-252; R. Schröder, *Lehrbuch der Deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (fifth ed., Leipzig, 1907), pp. 805-814. The best critical examination of the older writers and theories is by Georg von Below, *Die Ursachen der Rezeption des Römischen Rechts in Deutschland* (Munich, 1905). Cf. also Stölzel's review of v. Below in the *Kritische Vierteljahrschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft* (1907), XLVII. 1-49.

³ Cf. R. Stintzing, *Geschichte der populären Literatur des römisch-kanonischen Rechts in Deutschland* (Leipzig, 1867), one of the most valuable works on the Reception, quoted hereafter as Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*

What was the effect of this Reception of the Roman Law upon the German peasant in the time of Luther? In regard to this I venture to suggest that there has grown up a kind of legend. This legend, in a simple form which has been read by thousands of students in America, runs as follows: "The Roman civil law had indeed been brought in by the ecclesiastics, and the lords favored it because it tended to regard serfs as slaves. The serfs naturally hated it because it hardened their lot. There was no good in appealing to it. It was one of their grievances. So the peasants of each place must fight it out with their own lords. They must rebel or submit."⁴ Similar ideas are found very generally accepted by the most noted writers. Professor Maitland wrote: "There seems to be plentiful evidence that the learned *doctores juris* who counselled the German princes and obtained seats in the courts were cordially detested by the multitude. In modern times they often have to bear much blame for that terrible revolt which we know as the Peasants' War."⁵ And Professor Vinogradoff says: "We find the *Mirror of Actions* (*Klagspiegel*) trying to fit German class distinctions into the social classification of Rome in the same manner as this was done by Bracton. It translates fluently the Latin *servus* by *Eigen Mann*, that is, by 'serf'."⁶ "The 'reception' appears . . . mainly as a movement of the upper classes and of the political authorities connected with them. It encountered a good deal of opposition in the lower orders. Jurists were regarded as bad Christians (*Die Juristen sind böse Christen*). Every now and then one or the other among them was exposed to contumelious treatment, as, for example, two Constance doctors, whom a court of *Schöffen* in Thurgau put to flight, because it did not want to hear about Bartele and Baldele (Bartolus and Baldus), and was resolved to uphold its ancient customs. The revolutionary peasantry in 1525 declared in a fictitious document, nick-named 'The Reformation of the Emperor Frederick III.', 'that all doctors of laws should be abolished, and that justice should be administered according to the law of Moses, because it is not good for men to get better law than that proclaimed by God'.⁷"

These same views, that the Reception injured the peasantry and

⁴ F. Seeböhm, *Era of the Protestant Revolution* (New York, 1896), p. 33.

⁵ *English Law and the Renaissance* (Rede Lecture for 1901, Cambridge), p. 23.

⁶ *Roman Law in Mediaeval Europe* (New York, 1909), p. 119.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 129; but see note 56, below. Other recent statements in English of the depressing effect of the Roman law upon the peasants are by A. F. Pollard, in *Cambridge Modern History*, II. 176; by J. S. Schapiro, *Social Reform and the Reformation* (*Columbia Studies in History*, etc., 1909, XXXIV., no. 2), pp. 40-53, 61; and in a more extreme form by E. Belfort Bax, *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages* (London, 1894), pp. 219-228.

helped to cause the Peasant Revolt of 1525, are expressed with varying emphasis by many German authorities—by Protestants⁸ and Roman Catholics,⁹ by writers on peasant conditions,¹⁰ by historians of the law,¹¹ and by the philosophers of history.¹²

For the sake of clearness these ideas in regard to the Roman law and the German peasant which have been indicated above by quotation or reference, and which I have ventured to call a legend, may be briefly stated under three heads: (a) The jurists of the Reformation period did not understand or have any respect for German customary and local law. They recklessly applied Roman legal conceptions to German institutions, and so treated some of the peasants as Roman slaves. (b) Roman law was hated by the peasants because it hardened their lot. They made a "popular opposition" to it as a "foreign" law. (c) It was a grievance of the peasants and one of the direct causes of the Peasant Revolt of 1525.

To determine whether these commonly accepted ideas are true or legendary it is necessary to consider how far they are supported by contemporary sixteenth-century evidence, and how far they may be traced as a legend which has arisen in later times.

The most eminent German jurist of the sixteenth century is Ulrich Zasius (1461-1535).¹³ He is cited as a jurist who ignored or despised German law and misapplied Roman law to German conditions. After studying at Tübingen, Zasius became a town-clerk at Freiburg in the Breisgau, a doctor of laws in 1501, and two years later a professor of Roman law in the university. With his academic position he also retained his position as town-clerk, and

⁸ F. v. Bezold, *Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation* (Berlin, 1890, Oncken series), pp. 30-31, 44 seq., 452; *Kultur der Gegenwart* (1908), Theil II., Abth. V. i., p. 57; G. Egelhaaf, *Deutsche Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1889), I. 544 seq.

⁹ J. Janssen, *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (ninth ed., Freiburg, 1883), I. 473-503, especially 486-494; II. 431 seq.

¹⁰ W. Zimmermann, *Geschichte des Grossen Bauernkrieges* (first ed., Stuttgart, 1842), I. 314-315.

¹¹ O. Stobbe, *Geschichte der Deutschen Rechtsquellen* (Leipzig, 1860-1864), II. 49-56; Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, pp. xxiii seq.; Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* (fourth ed., Leipzig, 1899), p. xviii; Theodor Knapp, *Gesammelte Beiträge zur Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1902), p. 380.

¹² K. Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte* (third ed., Freiburg, 1904), V. i. 115-116.

¹³ The classic work on Zasius is still that of Stintzing (*Ulrich Zasius*, Basel, 1857), republished more briefly in his *Geschichte der Deutschen Rechtswissenschaft* (1880), I. 155 seq., and in an article in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. For more recent literature see R. Schmidt, *Zasius und seine Stellung in der Rechtswissenschaft* (Rektorsrede, Leipzig, 1904), pp. 48-50. Zasius's works were collected and edited by his son Johann Ulrich and his pupil Joachim Mynsinger: *Opera Omnia* (Lugduni, apud Sebastianum Gryphum, 1550, in 6 vols. fol.). It is from a copy of the reprint of 1590 (Frankfort), in the library of the Harvard Law School, that the citations below are made.

by practice became perfectly familiar with the town laws and customs. He made his legal influence felt by long years of university lecturing, by numerous writings, and in legislation by his assistance in drawing up a code for the town of Freiburg.

In the Freiburg code the Roman influence is indeed considerable; Zasius himself says that it was drawn up with his own aid and was in large part in conformity with Roman law.¹⁴ This was quite natural, for it dealt largely with procedure, contracts, mortgages, and inheritances, subjects which had reached a much fuller development in the commercial society of Rome than in the less advanced towns of Germany. Still, the city fathers, in entrusting Zasius with this codification, evidently had no fear that he would "utterly disregard the local German laws and customs in his endeavor to apply the comprehensive principles of Roman jurisprudence to German conditions".¹⁵ Nor did he do so. He attempted to co-ordinate and harmonize German and Roman principles. He even modified Roman principles to make them accord better with existing German institutions. He frequently refers to old German customs, quotes them, or corrects mistakes in them. He uses pure German legal phraseology with the exception of a few common Latin words like "testament", "contract", etc., which were already in common use and generally understood. In short, as Stintzing has rightly pointed out, the whole work bears the stamp of a jurist, but of one who is familiar with the existing conditions of life and who is ready to comply with them rather than anxious to force them to fit his own theories.¹⁶

The Freiburg code is significant of Zasius's practical knowledge of actual life and his respect for the customary law of a town. But as it deals with commercial rather than agricultural subjects, it tells us nothing of his attitude toward the peasantry or his influence upon them. This must be sought in his writings and lecture notes, in which there are several significant passages.

In a response "on certain unclassifiable things in German law",¹⁷ Zasius speaks of the *proprii homines*—the unfree peasants.¹⁸

¹⁴ "... novis legibus municipalibus, jure communi magna ex parte conformibus, ope nostra, superiore anno ita instruxit" (sc. Civitas Friburgum). *Opera*, I. 118, no. 12.

¹⁵ Schapiro, p. 45.

¹⁶ Stintzing, *Zasius*, p. 159.

¹⁷ *Responsa Singularia*, lib. II., cap. VII. (*Opera*, V. 36): "De anonymis quibusdam in jure nostro. . . Sic servi anonymi in nostra Germania homines proprii dicti, nec adscriptitii, nec coloni, nec capitecensi, nec statu liberi, nec liberti sunt, de omnium tamen natura aliquid participant. Istas igitur anonymas dispositiones recipi necesse est."

¹⁸ *Proprii homines* is the regular Latin equivalent of *Eigenleute*, *Eigenmenschen*, *Leibeigene*, *Halseigene*, etc.; these German words are used in sixteenth-

He names various Roman social classes, but is perfectly aware that none of the terms is properly applicable to the German unfree peasant. The German peasant is "anonymous" as far as classical Roman law is concerned.

Zasius was also perfectly aware of the variety and complexity of the German agrarian conditions which he had before his eyes daily in the fields about Freiburg. He many times uses such phrases as "hodie proprii homines in varia conditione", "in multiplici differentia", "pacta curialia mirifice variantia", etc. It was a subject on which he had burnt some midnight oil and on which he wrote a very interesting response.¹⁹

After discussing at length, as a student of classical Roman law, the text in the *Digest of Justinian on the dues of the Roman freedman*, he comes to the practical question, "How much of all this is applicable to men who in our own day might resemble slaves or freedmen?" His reply is that the German unfree peasants are like slaves in a certain few respects but are more like freedmen; that as Tacitus pointed out and as the evidence shows, there never have been real slaves in Germany. For the German *proprii homines*, though marked with some characteristics of slavery, nevertheless possess property of their own, live in houses of their own, and are not reckoned as a part of the lord's household.²⁰ They can inherit century documents in south and west Germany as the ordinary designations for a large part of the peasantry, the part which was personally unfree. In south and west Germany in the sixteenth century all peasants, from a public point of view, were subjects (*Untertanen*) of a political authority (*Gerichtsherr*); from an economic point of view, most peasants owed obligations to a landlord (*Grundherr*); and from a personal point of view, a great many peasants still paid fowls annually or made some recognition of the fact that they were personally unfree subjects (*Leibeigene*) of a personal lord (*Leibherr*). This personal unfreedom is *Leibeigenschaft*; it had been severe in its consequences in the Middle Ages, but was relatively mild in the sixteenth century. Later, in the seventeenth century, *Leibeigene* was used to designate east-Elbe peasants, who were really subject only politically and economically to a *Gutsherr* who combined in his single hand the rights of *Gerichtsherr* and *Grundherr*; in the seventeenth century these east-Elbe peasants came to have obligations forced upon them as if they were also personally unfree. Cf. below, notes 66 and 71; also the excellent analysis of the meaning of *Leibeigenschaft* by T. Knapp, *Gesammelte Beiträge zur Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1902), pp. 2-38, 85-95, 346-388. *Leibeigener* is often rendered in English by "serf", but as this word is used in many senses I prefer "unfree peasant" as closer to the true meaning of the sixteenth-century *Leibeigener*.

¹⁹ Responsa Singularia, lib. I., cap. III. (*Opera*, V. 15-19): "De operis, deque obsequiis libertorum ac earundem speciebus, insolita quaedam . . . Meas quoque vigilias ea in re addere placuit." The quotations and statements which follow are from this response.

²⁰ "Homines proprii in paucis quibusdam cum servis participant, et plus ad libertos respiciunt. Si quidem Germania pro Cornelii Taciti sententia veros servos nunquam habuit, id quod ipsa docet rei evidentia. Nam licet aliqui servili

ab intestato or *ex testamento*, serve as witnesses, sue in the courts, and engage in business on their own account. They can even make contracts with their lords, and are subject at law to the obligations of such contracts. There is a suggestion of slavery in the fact that the *homines proprii* are restricted in their freedom of marriage, but even in this case, Zasius says, they still resemble freedmen rather than slaves. In this connection he makes an interesting attempt to soften the contemporary German marriage restrictions by quoting in favor of the peasant two passages from the Digest which limit the patron's right to restrict the freedman's marriage. Zasius thinks this good Roman doctrine might well be inculcated on monasteries and nobles in Germany, to the benefit of the peasants.

He then gives a general statement of the various dues—fowls, payments in money, labor services, etc.—owed to the lord, and shows his sympathy with the peasantry by adding that there are many lords in Swabia, both lay and ecclesiastical, who are either poor or reckless in expenditure, who use their superior position to cheat their well-to-do peasants; for they borrow of them but never pay back the debt. Zasius's comments upon the labor services show the same sympathy with the peasantry and show also his respect for German customary law. "*Homines proprii*, where there is no special agreement, are bound to perform services only so far as they are according to the custom of the manor or of the neighborhood. . . . Even then they ought not to be so burdened with hard services as not to have sufficient time left for supporting themselves and their families." He recalls passages in the Digest which say that the patron ought to give the freedman a sufficient amount of time within which to do his services and ought not to demand services which are beyond the freedman's bodily capacity, and exclaims, "Quod utinam aetas nostra diligenter perpenderet!"

Similarly, referring to the fact that a great many of the peasants have statements of the mutual obligations of lord and peasant written down in a court roll, Zasius again exclaims, "These statements are observed strictly where they are in the lord's favor; would that they were also observed where the rights and advantages of the peasants are described!"

Finally, he considers the question whether *homines proprii* must provide the lord with the necessities of life. "If we look at the Roman law the matter is quickly settled because this was the duty of the freedman; but if we look at the German practice the question is doubtful, because clearly this *jus alimentorum* is not received

apud nos nota laborent, propria tamen bona possident, propriis degunt domibus, de familia domini non censentur." *Ibid.*

by German custom. Wherefore I drop the question; no one shall say that the burdens of the unfree peasants, which already under some lords are too hard, have been increased by my writings."

Zasius, however, did not confine himself to mere sympathy in his study. On several occasions he gave opinions in regard to the status of peasants; on one occasion he protected twenty-two unfree peasants from unjust treatment by the Count of Tübingen;²¹ on another he showed that when a noble forbade his peasants to pasture their cattle in the woods before a certain day under penalty of ten pounds and the peasants broke the rule, the peasants ought to be regarded collectively, and the penalty of ten pounds need be paid but once by all together.²²

Other passages might be cited, but these few give a fair idea of Zasius's legal treatment of, and real sympathy for, the unfree Swabian peasantry of his day. He understands their conditions and respects German customary law. He sees that the *homines proprii*—the unfree peasants—have little in common with Roman slaves, but do have some resemblances to Roman freedmen; but even here he does not recklessly apply the Roman law.

Of a different character from the writings of Zasius are the legal works of the unknown author of the *Richterliche Klagspiegel*, of Ulrich Tengler and of Perneder. Zasius was a scholar and wrote in Latin for other scholars. Though he did not neglect the practical writings of the Italian jurists and frequently cited from them with respect, he preferred to study the Roman law of Justinian's time and earlier. The writers now to be considered, on the other hand, wrote in German. They aimed to make practical handbooks of Roman law for German notaries and clerks who might not have had a university training. They were "popularizers". They sought their knowledge from the works of Italians like Azo, Baldus, Bartolus, Durantis, and Roffredus, rather than from an independent study of the *Corpus Juris*. Their actual influence upon the practical reception of the Roman law was probably greater than that of more learned men like Zasius. Do they apply the Roman law of slavery to German conditions to the injury of the peasant?

The *Richterliche Klagspiegel*, which is commonly attributed to Sebastian Brant,²³ was written by an unknown author, some time shortly before the invention of printing.²⁴ Judging from the dialect

²¹ R. Schmidt, *Zasius*, p. 69.

²² *Responsa ad tit. I. de Actionibus Poenalibus (Opera, IV. 31)*.

²³ This mistake is due to the fact that Brant brought out a new edition of it in 1516. He made no corrections or improvements of importance, but allowed many blunders to remain. The best account of this interesting law-book is by Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, pp. 337-407.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 356.

and other internal evidences, the author must have lived on the border land between Swabia and Franconia—a region of the later Peasant Revolt. His book must have had considerable vogue, as it was printed in at least five editions before 1500,²⁵ and in as many more during the next fifty years. The unknown author had mainly before him, and largely translated from, a treatise by Roffredus, as Stintzing has shown by a comparison of parallel passages; but he often found it very difficult to find a proper German phrase to translate a Roman one. He naïvely asks pardon for omitting some passages which were too hard for him, and for evading his difficulty at other times by setting down untranslated the Roman phrase itself.²⁶ He cannot, for instance, find any German equivalent for *libertus*; in the few cases where he comes across the term, he employs some circumlocution.²⁷ But he appears to think a consideration of Roman freedmen of little interest for Germany; for he gives very little attention to it—less than half a page—saying in explanation, “dise klag wurt selten geübet, darumb lass ichs fallen”.²⁸ The thing, however, which has been seized upon by modern writers²⁹ is the fact that the unknown author actually does in a few, though not many cases, translate *servus* by *eigen Mensch*. He could find no other good German equivalent. At first sight, therefore, it would seem that he is recklessly applying the Roman law of slavery to the German peasant. But in reality he is quite clear that the Roman law of slavery is not applicable in Germany, for he says emphatically, “Mark the fact that there is no *eigen Mensch* [i. e., like the Roman *servus*] either in Swabia or Franconia.”³⁰ Not satisfied with this, he takes pains in three other separate passages to reiterate that “there are none in the German lands.”³¹

²⁵ Hain, nos. 3726–3730. The quotations below are from an edition of 1553 in the Harvard University Library.

²⁶ Cf. fol. 96 a.

²⁷ “Wann libertus, das ist der, der eigen ist gewesen” (fol. 1 b).

²⁸ Fol. 42 a. He refers his reader to Azo for further information.

²⁹ Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, pp. 369–371; Vinogradoff, cf. above, note 6.

³⁰ Fol. 34 b: “Merck was auss unseren eigen Frawen geboren würt, ist unser eigen. Merck, auss dem du magst wol verstehen, das in Schwaben kein eigen mensch ist, noch in Franken”.

³¹ Fol. 82 b: “Es mag gepeinigt werden der freieboren und der eigen mensch, sie seind aber nit in teutschen landen.” Fol. 82 b: “Wo der schuldner wissentlich dem glauber hette zu pfand gesetzt ein eigen mensch . . . diss libel setzte ich nit, wann diesselben eigen menschen seind in teutschen landen nit”. Fol. 119 a: “Wann wer sie [die fraw, die dz ehebrechen gelitten hat] eigen, so het dise verklagung nit statt. . . Auch ist nit not mehr davon zu setzen, wann es ist kein eigen mensch in teutschen landen von denen die obgeschriben recht sagen”. When he comes in the treatise which he is following to the *actio tributoria*, which is an action growing out of a Roman slave relationship, he says (fol. 3 a), “Next comes the action known as Tributoria; but it is not used here and therefore I omit it.”

There were, of course, a great many peasants who were commonly called *eigene Menschen* in southwest Germany in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and while the author of the *Klagspiegel* was clear in his own mind that they were not at all the same as Roman slaves it is perhaps open to question whether his less-informed readers may not have depressed the German peasant by a blind application of the passages in the *Klagspiegel* where *servus* is translated by *eigen Mensch*. This may have happened occasionally, though I have been unable to find any case of it; but, as will appear from the consideration of Tengler and Perneder, it could not have been very generally done; neither of these writers was led to do it. Moreover, the unknown author was much more interested in forms of procedure and in criminal law than in the rules of private law. Aside from a very brief treatment of the rules of *peculium* (fol. 3 b), *de servo corrupto* (fol. 9 b), *de liberali causa* (fol. 34 b), and *unde vi* (fol. 97 b), the passages in which *servus* is translated by *eigen Mensch* are in large part merely incidental. They are not passages which discuss status, or other subjects which, if given full treatment on the analogy of Roman slavery, might have tended to depress considerably the legal position of the German unfree peasants.³² The unknown author's use of *eigen Mensch* for *servus* is rather a discovery of the nineteenth century than a depressing factor in the hands of sixteenth-century practitioners.

What has been said of the *Klagspiegel* of the fifteenth century is confirmed by two of the most popular and influential writers of the first half of the sixteenth century—Ulrich Tengler and Andreas Perneder. Both lived in the region of the Peasant Revolt, and wrote handbooks explaining existing German law and popularizing so much of the Roman law as they considered applicable in Ger-

³² Professor Vinogradoff makes the interesting suggestion (*Roman Law in Mediaeval Europe*, p. 119) that "we find the *Klagspiegel* trying to fit German class distinctions into the social classification of Rome in the same manner as this was done by Bracton." But Bracton was greatly interested in just this question of status (*cf.* the parallel passages of Azo and Bracton, with notes by Professor Maitland, in the *Publications of the Selden Society*, VIII, 42-82). As Professor Vinogradoff himself points out (pp. 97 *seq.*) "Bracton follows Azo as to the principal and very important generalization 'all men are either free or slaves'. . . Villains are equated with slaves. . . [He] maintained that there was no difference between a serf and a villain." The unknown author of the *Klagspiegel*, on the other hand, completely avoided any consideration of this fundamental Roman dilemma, "omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi." I venture to think, therefore, that the analogy between him and Bracton is not complete and that it would be dangerous to apply for him in Germany Professor Vinogradoff's conclusion for Bracton in England (p. 101) that "the infusion of Roman doctrine made the legal treatment of villainage harder than might have been the case otherwise."

many. Tengler describes conditions shortly before, and Perneder shortly after, the Peasant Revolt.

Tengler,³³ as town-clerk of Nördlingen and then as provincial judge for the Duke of Bavaria at Höchstädt, had ample opportunity during a long life to become familiar with the law. He did not confine himself, however, he says in his preface, to his own study and practice, but sought information from others "learned in the law". He took as his model the *Speculum* of Durantis; but he realized that not all Roman law was applicable in Germany and that a great deal of the law in force depended on "well-founded (German) regulations and praiseworthy customs". From these he draws largely. In the single very brief passage—less than half a page—in which he discusses the unfree he suggests in a perfunctory way how persons become unfree, contrary to natural law, by birth, captivity, or debt, and refers to the similar passage in Justinian's Institutes (I. 3); he then concludes with the statement that "the obligations which the unfree owe to their lords depend on all sorts of burdensome usages and customs which cannot be briefly explained in the *Laienspiegel*, but can only be learned by experience in practice of the law."³⁴ That is, he does not treat the German *Leibeigener* as a Roman *servus* nor define his obligations in Roman terms; he regards him simply as one of the German social class whose obligations are heavy, and vary from place to place according to local German custom, and can only be learned by observation and practice. It is noticeable also that he does not include *Eigenleute* in his list of persons who may not sue in the courts (fol. 6 a) nor in the list of those who cannot serve as witnesses (fol. 50 b).

Perneder,³⁵ legal adviser of the city of Munich and later councillor of the Duke of Bavaria, being of a studious and practical turn of mind, compiled in his leisure hours a popular law-book.³⁶ As,

³³ The best account of Tengler and his work is by Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, pp. 411-447. Cf. Stobbe, II. 170-173. The first edition of the *Laienspiegel* was published at Augsburg in 1509. Its popularity is attested by the frequency with which it was reprinted: at Augsburg in 1509, 1511, 1512, at Strassburg in 1510, 1511, 1514, 1516, 1518, and at least six more times before the middle of the century. The quotations below are from a Strassburg edition of 1510 in the Hohenzollern Collection, Harvard University.

³⁴ *Laienspiegel*, fol. X a: "Auch wes sie [die eygenleüthe] iren herren müssen verpflicht, des sein menigerley beschwerlich gebrauch und gewonheit, die hierinn mit kurtz nit zu erklaren, sonder bey den erfaren der recht zu erfinden sein mogen". *Eigenleute*, used here, is another common equivalent for *Leibeigene*; cf. above, note 18.

³⁵ Cf. Stintzing, *Gesch. d. Rechtswissenschaft*, I. 573-579; Stobbe, II. 173-174; F. Litten, *Röm. Recht und Pandekten Recht* (Berlin, 1907), pp. 53-54.

³⁶ *Institutiones Auszug und Anzaigung etlicher geschriben Kaiserlichen und des Heyligen Reichs Rechten* (Ingolstadt, 1555; printed first in 1545, and often reprinted).

according to his own statement, he planned to give those passages of the Roman law which were actually in force in Germany in his own day, it is significant that he does not give the slightest account of the Roman law of slavery. On the contrary, in his chapter "on those who are subject to the law of another", under the heading "Von Leibeygenschaft in teutscher Nation", he refers to the fact that in ancient times the unfree had no property of their own, according to the Roman principle, "quodcumque per servum adquiretur, id domino adquiretur", and then adds distinctly: "But the (Roman) law in this case especially is not at all observed by us Germans."³⁷ He goes on to explain, evidently following Zasius, how the German unfree are unlike the Roman slaves but in some respects may be compared to the Roman freedmen.

Thus, it appears that the leading legal writers, both learned and popular, of Luther's time did not ignore German customary law in regard to agrarian conditions, and did not treat the German unfree peasant as a Roman slave.

Having considered what the Roman lawyer of Luther's time thought of the German peasant, one wishes to know what the peasant thought of the lawyer and the Roman law. According to the commonly accepted opinion he cordially hated them; there was a "popular opposition" to the "foreign" law; the Roman law was one of the grievances of the peasant and a direct cause of the Peasant Revolt of 1525. It is interesting to examine first the contemporary evidence alleged in support of these opinions. It consists chiefly of the complaints of provincial estates and of satirists and reformers, and of an anecdote of what happened in Thurgau.

In 1497 the provincial estates of Bavaria complained to their duke that the courts are not provided with officials in the proper fashion; that there are many "learned men" and few of the native nobility; that the book of Bavarian law, which "outlandish" men are not acquainted with, lies unused; that consequently there arise new laws unknown to our forefathers and contrary to the common rules and custom of our land; that from all this arises much distress,

³⁷ Fol. 6 b. The same statement is also found in another much used law-book, entitled: *Statuten Buch, Gesetz, Ordnungen und Gebräuch Kaiserlicher Allgemainer und etlicher Besonderer Land und Stett Rechten* (Frankfort, 1553), fol. 5 a: "Vor Zeiten haben die Leibeygene Knecht innhalt geschribener Recht gar nichts eygens gehabt, sonder was sie uberkommen ist alles des Herren gewesen. *Institut. per quas person. nobis acquir.* Es werden aber die Recht in disem fall sonderlich bei uns Teutschen gar nit ghalten und unsere leibeygen leut mehr den freigelassenen in Latein Liberti genant, vergleicht. Besitzen eygne güter, wonen in eygnen heusern, werden auch under dem haussgesinde des Herrn gar nit gzelt. Item sie mögen . . . eben so wohl als die Freien personn mit und on Testament erben haben", etc. Cf. Zasius, above, note 20.

evil, and confusion.³⁸ In 1514 the estates of Württemberg made a similar complaint and in 1515, as well as on several subsequent occasions, the Tyrolese estates did likewise.³⁹

These complaints are cited as evidence of the "popular opposition" to the "foreign" law.⁴⁰ But these complaints are not an expression of peasant opinion at all; they are not "popular" complaints; they are the complaints of the estates, and the estates represent the opinions of the lesser nobility, the clergy, and the towns, but not of the peasants or "people".⁴¹ Furthermore these complaints are not a certain evidence of opposition to the Roman law even on the part of the lesser nobility. In Bavaria, for instance, what the nobility objected to in 1497 was not the Roman law;⁴² they objected primarily, as they had been objecting for a couple of centuries and before there was any question of Roman law, that the duke did not always reserve the best offices for "honorable and respectable men, who can show quarterings on their arms, and who are natives of Bavaria",⁴³ in other words for themselves.

The gibes of the satirists, likewise, cannot be properly regarded

³⁸ O. Franklin, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Reception des Römischen Rechts in Deutschland* (Hannover, 1863), p. 23; cf. below, note 42.

³⁹ V. Below, *Ursachen*, pp. 70-92; Sartori-Montecroce, *Beiträge zur Oesterr. Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte* (Innsbruck, 1895), pp. 9 seq.; F. Hirn, *Gesch. d. Tiroler Landtage von 1518 bis 1525* (Pastor's *Erläuterungen zu Janssen's Geschichte*, IV., heft 5, 1905); H. V. Voltolini, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Oest. Geschichtsforschung*, XXIX. (1908) 182-188; H. Wopfner, *Die Lage Tirols zu Ausgang des Mittelalters und die Ursachen des Bauernkrieges* (Munich, 1908), pp. 183 seq.

⁴⁰ Stobbe, II. 50-51; Janssen, I. 492; Schapiro, p. 52.

⁴¹ The composition and number of estates varied greatly in the different territories in Germany. Ordinarily the lesser nobility was by far the most influential element. Even in the very few instances (East Friesland, Kempten, to some extent the Tyrol, and a few tiny territories in central Germany) in which free peasants had a slight representation, the peasant influence was wholly overshadowed by that of the other estates. Cf. v. Below, *Territorium und Stadt*, pp. 163-282, on the "System und Bedeutung der landständischen Verfassung", especially pp. 198-222.

⁴² It is not true that "In 1463 Duke Johann of Bavaria was forced to promise that he would not appoint jurists to his courts and would eradicate all Roman law" (Schapiro, p. 52); what he promised was, "das wir unsere gericht allenthalben in niderland [Lower Bavaria] mit erbaren leumbtigen leuten, die wapensgenoss sein, darzu die landschranken redlich und nach notturft besetzen wollen, darmit die recht aufrichtiglich gefurdert werden" (Franklin, *l. c.*, p. 20). In 1497 the estates did not speak of "juris Romani professores" but merely of "Gelehrten"; the Latin phrase specifically mentioning Roman law is a later translation published by an eighteenth-century writer with an animus against the Roman law; this loose Latin version has become a *locus classicus* in the legend, since Eichhorn called attention to it (cf. below, note 74).

⁴³ For the constant repetition of this idea of 1463 (cf. German text in preceding note) as far back as the first part of the fourteenth century, see Franklin, *l. c.*, pp. 11-34 (ch. II., "Die landständischen Freiheitsbriefe").

as certain expressions of the peasant attitude toward the jurists and the Roman law; nor are they directed so much at the Roman law, or at jurists as representatives of the Roman law, as against jurists as individuals who were not free from human frailties.⁴⁴ Also, aside from the fact that it is dangerous to take satirists too seriously, many of their charges against the jurists are the expressions of an individual with a special grievance and do not necessarily represent a general feeling. Ulrich von Hutten, for instance, who is much quoted for the passages in which he pays his respects to the jurists,⁴⁵ belonged to the class of free imperial knights, that anomalous feudal survival from the German Middle Ages, which was rapidly being pushed to the wall by the new political forces of Luther's time. Hutten, like the Bavarian nobility, was jealous of this new class which stood for law and order, and which was getting places of more and more influence with the emperor and the rising territorial princes.⁴⁶ It may well have been the gall of jealousy and failure that was the motive of Thomas Murner's outbursts in the "Gild of Rogues".⁴⁷ Murner was a literary charlatan who first gained notoriety by giving humanistic courses on the classics at Freiburg; then he taught logic by the use of playing-cards and prosody by checkers with such success that he was held by some to be a wizard. Noticing the growing favor which was being accorded to Roman law, he offered to the public a "playing-cards edition of Justinian's Institutes". In this, by pictures and artificial devices to aid the memory, he guaranteed to teach anyone, "even one who knows little or nothing", the sum and substance of Justinian's Institutes "in four weeks; let no one be frightened away by the shortness of the time".⁴⁸ This venture had no commercial success, but widened the breach between him and the serious-minded jurists. Zasius, indignant at such nonsense, denounced Murner in no uncertain terms,⁴⁹ and prevented him from getting the degree of doctor of

⁴⁴ Cochlaeus, quoted by Janssen, I. 491, is exceptional in specifically denouncing the law of Justinian.

⁴⁵ Quoted at length by Stobbe, II. 45-47.

⁴⁶ He complains in the "Robbers", (*Opera*, ed. Böcking, IV. 378), "Quorum scribae totum regebant Maximilianum nobis . . . et abutebantur simplice principe ut volebant." *Ibid.*, p. 383: "Quoties aguntur apud Principes controversiae, hî statim accersuntur Sapientes, qui dejudicent, occupantque Principum aulas ipsi, ejecta nobilitate, soli."

⁴⁷ Quoted by Zimmermann, *Bauernkrieg* (first edition), I. 314, by Janssen, I. 488, and by Schapiro, p. 48.

⁴⁸ *Chartiludium Institute summarie doctore Thoma Murner memorante et ludente*; cf. L. Sieber, "Thomas Murner und sein juristisches Kartenspiel", in *Beiträge z. vaterl. Gesch. herausg. v. d. histor. Gesellschaft in Basel*, X. (1875) 273-312; and Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, pp. 465-467.

⁴⁹ *Opera*, I. 122; Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, p. 467.

laws.⁵⁰ This personal hostility between Murner and more successful writers was probably not without its influence on the author of the "Gild of Rogues".⁵¹

The piece of evidence which is perhaps urged most often and with the greatest confidence, and which is also most typical in the growth of the legend, is the Thurgau anecdote.⁵² This anecdote, which is delightfully picturesque but too long to be quoted here, was first given prominence in an abbreviated form by G. L. Maurer in 1824, but may be traced to its original author in a longer form.⁵³ A certain German named Kreydenmann went to the Swiss village of Frauenfeld in Thurgau and after "a noble dinner" and "all sorts of discourse" heard some one tell how a Roman jurist from Constance had once been shown the court-room door at Frauenfeld for quoting two Italian Romanists.⁵⁴ Now, instead of this being evidence of hostility to Roman law in Germany at the beginning of the sixteenth century, as is assumed by all the writers who follow Maurer, it really appears from the original account that it is evidence, not for Germany, but for Switzerland; in fact, the very reason why Kreydenmann notes the anecdote is to show how Switzerland, to which the influence of the *Reichskammergericht* did not extend and in which Roman law was not "received", differed from Germany; and, in the second place, the anecdote does not belong to Luther's day at all, but to the seventeenth century. Here, as elsewhere, the legend has been made to rest upon evidence which has been transferred from the seventeenth to the sixteenth century.⁵⁵ Also the accuracy itself of facts told after "a noble dinner" and "all sorts of discourse" may be open to some question.

Finally, there is the so-called Reformation of the Emperor Fred-

⁵⁰ Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, p. 462; Murner was already a doctor of theology.

⁵¹ That Murner tried to popularize the Roman Institutes and at the same time denounced jurists is significant of the fact stated above: that such opposition as existed was opposition to jurists as individuals and not as representatives of Roman law. Similarly Sebastian Brant and Zasius, both of whom had a high opinion of Roman law and wrote and edited many works dealing with it, take occasion to score members of their own profession. Cf. similarly Luther's *Tischreden, Sämmtliche Werke* (Erlangen, 1854), LXII. 214-284.

⁵² By Vinogradoff, cf. note 7 above; Maitland, *l. c.*, p. 83; Janssen, I. 492; Stintzing, *Pop. Lit.*, p. xxv; Zoepfl, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (fourth ed., 1871), I. 226; and by G. L. Maurer, cf. below, note 75.

⁵³ J. C. Kreydenmann, *Tractatus von der Reichsritterschaft* (1646), Quaestio 28, § 16, printed in Burgermeister's *Bibliotheca Equestris* (Ulm, 1720), I. ii. 757.

⁵⁴ "Hort ihr, Doctor! wir Eydgenossen fragen nicht nach dem Barthele und Baldele und andern Doctorn, wir haben sonderbahre Landbrüch und Recht. Naus mit euch, Doctor, naus mit euch. Und habe der gute Doctor müssen abtreten . . ."

⁵⁵ Cf. below, note 76. Kreydenmann told the anecdote in 1646.

erick III., a radical and somewhat incoherent panacea proposed shortly before 1525 for the social and political ills of Germany. It is drawn in part from earlier reform plans of the fifteenth century, a fact which led many writers to attribute it by mistake to Frederick III.⁵⁶ But it also breathes the spirit of fanatical opposition to political and especially ecclesiastical authority, which is common in the radical writings that, after 1520, began to follow in the wake of Lutheranism. It says (Art. V.) in hostile language that there ought not to be any doctors of law, civil or canon, in the courts or councils of princes, though three doctors ought to be maintained at each university in Germany who may study law and be appealed to for decisions in cases of doubt. This hostility is due partly to a common tendency among the fanatical writers of the period to identify the jurists representing Roman law with the bitterly hated ecclesiastical authorities representing canon law. The same man often held the degree in both laws and the blind hatred felt for the Roman church officials was easily transferred and extended to the jurists. It is due partly also to the fact that this document is probably the work of a group of free imperial knights, that is, of a class which had special reasons for hating jurists as well as ecclesiastics. Though this document circulated among the peasants it certainly was not written by a peasant; its statements cannot be regarded as the spontaneous expression of peasant opinion but rather as ideas suggested to them by the knights.

On the other hand, if one turns to the Twelve Articles and the local statements of grievances which were drawn up in the winter and spring of 1524-1525 and which do clearly express peasant opinion, there is no direct indication of hostility to jurists or the Roman law.⁵⁷ There are complaints against new burdensome reg-

⁵⁶ Cf. Stobbe, II. 50-53. Schapiro, pp. 100-114, gives a translation and a brief account of the theories in regard to this document. H. Werner, "Die Reformation des Kaisers Friedrich III.", in *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst* (1909), XXVIII. 29-70, and (1910), XXIX. 83-117, has recently shown good reasons for believing that it was the work, not of the peasants, but of the West-German *Reichsritterschaft* under the lead of Franz von Sickingen and that it was written out by Hartmuth von Cronberg in Landau in August, 1522, sent to Luther, and printed in 1523. It was the basis for a very similar document known as Hipler's Reformation; some of the same ideas are found in the reform projects of Eberlin v. Günzburg and of Geismayer; cf. Schapiro, pp. 115-160.

⁵⁷ Cf. original documents or summaries of them given by Oechsle, Bensen, Jörg, Baumann, and Hartfelder in their volumes on the Peasant Revolt; also H. Wopfner, *Quellen z. Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Deutschtirol* (Innsbruck, 1908). The phrase, *Juristen sind böse Christen*, appears to have originated, not with the peasants, but with learned theologians who were attacking the jurists on theological grounds (cf. Stintzing, *Das Sprichwort: "Juristen böse Christen"*,

ulations, arbitrary judgments, excessive punishments, unfair advocates,⁵⁸ and undue costs. But these complaints do not specifically indicate the jurists, and still less the Roman law, as causes of these evils. Nor is there any hint of a complaint that jurists were treating the unfree peasants as Roman slaves. It is likewise significant that in that great storehouse of genuine peasant ideas, Grimm's *Weistümer*, there is not the slightest indication of any hostility to Roman law or jurists.⁵⁹ In fact the peasants had very little acquaintance with it, for Roman law permeated only very slowly from the higher courts of the emperor, princes, and towns down into the local country courts before which most peasant litigation came. The dissatisfaction, evidenced by the complaints of lack of justice in the grievances of 1524-1525, was really often dissatisfaction with an oppressive and abusive use of German law and German legal procedure. This dissatisfaction sometimes led people, as Stölzel has shown from an examination of the local records of Hesse in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, actually to turn from the German courts and seek the arbitration of some Roman-trained official in the service of the territorial prince.⁶⁰ In other cases persons took appeals from the judgment of the popular court, where the people had rendered judgment according to German law, and carried their case voluntarily to the supreme court of the territorial prince where jurists were ordinarily in a majority.⁶¹ This could never have happened if there had been any general consciousness of the application of a "foreign" and oppressive Roman law.⁶²

It is perhaps a further indication that peasants did not hate and detest jurists and Roman law that many peasants, along with the

Bonn, 1875, pp. 5-10). Stintzing, under the influence of nineteenth-century ideas indicated below, assumes (pp. 13, 16) that this phrase was used by the peasants in 1525, but admits (p. 13) that there is no direct evidence for this assumption.

⁵⁸ Complaints against "Vorsprecher", which were common in Luther's day as in earlier centuries before the Reception, have been often interpreted as complaints against Roman jurists and even against Roman law; but the Vorsprecher existed as an official in the old German legal system before the Reception of the Roman law; he formulated for the parties the proper answers in court; by an abusive practice he was often allowed even to formulate the decision of the case; and he also roused resentment by various evil practices; cf. A. Weissler, *Geschichte der Rechtsanwaltschaft* (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 25 seq., 74-83.

⁵⁹ This statement is made partly on the basis of a reading of a large part of the *Weistümer* dating from 1450 to 1550 and partly on the supposition that the voluminous index made by R. Schröder (vol. VII, 1878) is complete. In fact there is no mention of Roman law, with one exception, VI. 721 (undated).

⁶⁰ A. Stölzel, *Entwicklung des gelehrten Richterthums* (Stuttgart, 1872), I. 142-165; II. 177 seq.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, I. 166-231; II. 61-66.

⁶² Cf. *ibid.*, I. 35-42.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XVI.—17.

young men from the towns, studied law at the universities and eventually secured official positions which had formerly been largely monopolized by the clergy and lesser nobility. The desire of Luther's father that his son should become a jurist is not an exceptional case.⁶³

Finally, the Peasant Revolt, of which the jurists and Roman law have been commonly regarded as a cause, is sufficiently explained on other economic, political, and religious grounds, as has been shown in several recent monographs on special localities.⁶⁴ In the spring months of 1525, when the peasants began to murder nobles and clergy and burn castles and monasteries, one does not find any German peasant making the cheerful suggestion which Shakespeare attributes to one of Jack Cade's followers: "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers."

How then did these commonly accepted ideas, which are not supported by sixteenth-century contemporary evidence, come into being? How did the legend arise? Like other legends it grew from small beginnings and from a combination of several elements. It germinated in a confusion of peasant conditions east and west of the Elbe. It began to grow through the assignment to the sixteenth century of what really happened in the seventeenth century. It was strengthened by the growth of a nationalistic German feeling. And it reached its present form through the tendency of writers to copy blindly second-hand statements, or even, in the interest of a theory or prejudice, to make generalizations not warranted by the facts.

Peasant conditions east of the Elbe have had a very different development from those west of the Elbe.⁶⁵ In the East, in the lands once occupied by the Slavs, German colonists settled in the thirteenth century as free peasants. But in the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, owing to peculiar economic and political conditions, these free peasants sank into a condition little

⁶³ Cf. Max Lenz, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXVII. 401 seq.

⁶⁴ H. Wopfner, *Die Lage Tirols zu Ausgang des Mittelalters und die Ursachen des Bauernkrieges* (Berlin, 1908), pp. 184-189; W. Stölze, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Bauernkrieges* (Berlin dissert., 1900), p. 14; F. Kiener, "Zur Vorgesch. d. Bauernkrieges", in *Zeitschrift f. Geschichte des Oberrheins*, Neue Folge, XIX.; cf. also Kaser, in *Deutsche Geschichtsblätter*, IV. (1903) 301-309; A. Memminger, *Zur Gesch. der Bauernlasten* (Würzburg, 1908), p. 117.

⁶⁵ For excellent general accounts of the contrast between the great produce-yielding estates of the cultivating lords in the east (*Gutsherrschaften*) and the rent-yielding estates of landlords in the south and west of Germany (*Grundherrschaften*) see v. Below, *Territorium und Stadt*, pp. 1-96, and T. Knapp, *Gesammelte Beiträge*, pp. 348-388, reprinted from *Zeit. d. Savigny Stiftung*, XIX. (1898) 16-51. For monographs on special regions see Dahlmann-Waitz, *Quellenkunde* (seventh ed., 1906), nos. 1706-1746, and *Ergänzungsband* (1907), nos. 1696-1745.

better than that of Roman slaves.⁶⁶ This deterioration was not at first in any way due to the jurists or the Roman law,⁶⁷ but by the time the deterioration was largely accomplished, that is, by the close of the sixteenth century, there appeared Roman jurists who did recklessly apply the Roman law of slavery to these poor east-Elbe peasants. This was first actually done in 1590, nearly three quarters of a century after the Peasant Revolt, by a Mecklenburg jurist named Husanus. Enamored of the Roman law, ignorant of history, without even an accurate observation of peasant conditions about him, and scarcely twenty-four years of age, he wrote a tract which amply deserves the reproaches which have been heaped upon the jurists.⁶⁸ He says: "The peasantry of north Germany represent for us the exact image of ancient slavery. All the laws sanctioned in regard to slaves may be properly transferred and applied to our peasants."⁶⁹ For his authority he quotes from Justinian's Digest. Here is the beginning of the legend.

From the beginning of the seventeenth century it became common for Romanizing jurists, following Husanus and quoting his arguments and false analogies, to regard the depressed east-Elbe peasants as Roman slaves; in so doing they depressed them still farther. The legend, thus germinated, then began to grow from the fact that later writers did not always distinguish between conditions east and west of the Elbe nor between conditions of the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries. Ideas held in the seventeenth century in regard to east-Elbian peasants were carelessly transferred

⁶⁶ The east-Elbe noble, deprived of his former congenial occupation of fighting, turned to agriculture, increased the number of acres under direct cultivation, expropriated peasants, and forced those who remained to perform steadily increasing agricultural services; when the peasant tried to run away or sell his land he was prevented by his lord, who feared to lose his services. The nobles were able to exploit and depress their peasants for their own selfish interests, partly because they put enough pressure on the weak territorial prince to make him legalize their actions, and partly because they had secured a jurisdictional as well as economic authority over the peasant; the lord was both *Gerichtsherr* and *Grundherr*, and if he wished to make an oppressive use of this double authority there was no help for the peasant; cf. above, note 18.

⁶⁷ F. Grossmann, "Ueber die gutsherrlich-bäuerlichen Rechtsverhältnisse in der Mark Brandenburg", in Schmoller's *Forschungen*, IX. (1890), heft 4, pp. 18-49; C. Beyer, *Die Regierung und die Bauern, Kulturgeschichtliche Bilder aus Mecklenburg* (Berlin, 1903), p. 16; H. Böhlau, "Ueber Ursprung und Wesen der Leibeigenschaft in Mecklenburg", in *Zeit. f. Rechtsgeschichte*, X. (1872) 357-387; C. J. Fuchs, "Der Untergang des Bauernstandes und das Aufkommen der Gutsherrschaft nach archivalischen Quellen aus Neu-Vorpommern und Rügen" (Strassburg, 1888, in G. F. Knapp's *Abhandlungen*, heft VI.), pp. 39 seq.

⁶⁸ *Tractatus de Servis seu Hominibus Propriis, in quo tum veteris, tum hodiernae Servitutis Jura breviter ac dilucide explicantur*. It was twice printed in 1590, again in 1663, and again in 1699; cf. Böhlau, *l. c.*, pp. 387-426.

⁶⁹ *Tractatus*, II. 25 and 37.

and imputed to sixteenth-century jurists in regard to peasant conditions in south and west Germany.⁷⁰ This mistake was all the more natural because of another. Up to the seventeenth century the east-Elbe peasants were ordinarily designated in an historically proper fashion as "peasants" (*Bauern*), "subjects" (*Untertanen*), or "settlers" (*Lassiten*). But in the seventeenth century, partly owing to a confusion of terms, and partly owing to the influence of Husanus and his followers, east-Elbian peasants come to be designated as *Leibeigene*.⁷¹ This was the same word as was used, though with a somewhat different meaning, for West German unfree peasants in the sixteenth century.

The legend, thus started, took strength from the growth of a nationalistic school of German jurists—of men who had a love for, and a pride in, the old German law. This feeling first finds decisive expression in Conring's remarkable pamphlet, *De Origine Juris Germanici* (1643). Conring, who laid aside his profession of physician to come to the rescue of a Helmstadt professor of law who had been attacked for denying the authority of the Roman law in medieval Germany, is the first of a long line of eminent Germanists.⁷² These Germanists were naturally ready to think evil of the rival system of Roman law and its adherents. Thomasius, Senckenberg, and others in the eighteenth century began to reproach not only the Romanists of their own day but also those of the sixteenth century with a harmful disregard of German law, and a still more harmful application of false Roman analogies to German conditions. The antagonism was deepened, after Napoleon's invasion of Germany and the introduction of the Code Napoleon into parts of western Germany, by the conflicts which arose between those who wished to make a code for Germany, and those who, like Savigny and his "historical" school, maintained that the time was not yet ripe for this. The Germanists were strengthened after the overthrow of Napoleon by the strong nationalistic spirit, by the Romantic movement, and a little later by the activity of the Grimm brothers in reviving the German Middle Ages. Under the influence of philosophy there was developed the conception of a self-conscious Ger-

⁷⁰ Cf. below, note 76.

⁷¹ In Pomerania in official documents as early as 1616 (Fuchs, p. 71); in Mecklenburg in 1633 (Beyer, p. 41); and in Brandenburg in 1632 the Elector, replying to the nobility of the Neumark, speaks of their "hergebrachten Leibeigenschaft über ihre Untertanen (Grossmann, p. 32, note 5); cf. above, note 18.

⁷² Stobbe, II. 418 seq.; Stintzing, *Gesch. d. Rechtsw.*, II. 3-6, 165-188. According to F. Frensdorff, "Das Wiedererstehen des Deutschen Rechts", in *Zeit. d. Savigny St.*, XXIX. (1908) 48, the word "Germanist", as applied to the school opposed to the "Romanists", does not occur until 1791.

man "folk".⁷³ Eichhorn, in his account of the Reception, relying on the loose Latin version of the complaints of the Bavarian nobility, had already assumed that there were "very lively complaints against the Doctors and the way they applied Roman law to German conditions".⁷⁴ Then G. L. Maurer, writing under the influence of this philosophy and nationalistic feeling, and with the avowed purpose of showing the advantages of the old German procedure and securing its adoption again in Germany,⁷⁵ went much further. Taking as a basis the passage in Eichhorn, the writings of Hutten and "such other true friends of the fatherland", the Thurgau anecdote, and the so-called Reformation of Frederick III., he exaggerates and generalizes these class or individual expressions of opinion into a general popular opposition of the whole German nation, not only to the jurists, but also to the Roman law; he brands the Roman law as "foreign" to the spirit of the free German people, and represents the people at the time of the Reception as bitterly conscious that it was a "foreign" law. Then this idea was further developed by G. Beseler, K. Hagen, C. A. Schmidt, and other Germanistic legal writers.

Meanwhile Zimmermann was writing a popular history of the Peasant Revolt, and seeking for as many causes as possible to prove the misfortunes of the peasants and the cruel oppression of the ruling classes. He not only accepted the general Germanistic charges against the Roman law, but greatly added to the legend by accepting and alleging what happened in Pomerania in the seventeenth century as characteristic of southwest Germany at the opening of the sixteenth century.⁷⁶ Zimmermann's book has been

⁷³ Cf. Hegel, *Philosophie des Rechts* (1821), and S. Brie, *Die Idee des Volksgeistes bei Hegel* (Breslau, 1909).

⁷⁴ Eichhorn, *Deutsche Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte*, § 444, note a; the first edition was in 1808. On the complaint of the Bavarian nobility, cf. above, notes 40-43.

⁷⁵ G. L. Maurer, *Gesch. des Altgermanischen . . . Gerichtsverfahrens, dessen Vortheile, Nachtheile und Untergang* (Heidelberg, 1824), Vorrede, p. vi: "Das gerichtliche Verfahren war noch wahre Volkssitte, die erst in den im späteren Mittelalter aufgedrungenen *fremden Gesetzen* ihren Untergang fand. . . Mein innigster Wunsch ist es wenigstens, dass wir, wie in anderer, so auch in dieser Hinsicht, von dem Fremden lassen und zum Einheimischen . . . zurück kehren möchten. Zumal da das nationale Verfahren unläugbare Vortheile vor dem Fremden . . .", etc.

⁷⁶ W. Zimmermann, *Allgemeine Gesch. des Grossen Bauernkrieges* (first ed., Stuttgart, 1841), I. 313: "The introduction of the Roman Law, unwholesome in so many respects, was especially so as regards its oppressiveness for the common man. Since the close of the fifteenth century the doctors of law gave decisions according to Roman law. With their heads full of Roman jurisprudence and Roman terms, and ignorant of old German law and old German conditions, they confused and muddled native and foreign law; by their decisions they depressed

much quoted by writers on the Peasants' War; his statements about the Roman law have been uncritically accepted, and the idea that it was a cause of the Peasant Revolt has strengthened the idea that it was opposed and hated by the people. Finally Janssen, a Catholic historian anxious to show that Germany was worse off in the Lutheran age than earlier, and therefore inclined to magnify any influences which have been regarded as depressing to the peasant, has emphasized those passages in the sixteenth-century literature which serve his purpose, and given the legend the form from which later writers have largely quoted.⁷⁷

In summary, then, I would say that an examination of the writings of Zasius and other jurists and writers of the sixteenth century does not support the commonly accepted ideas that the introduction of the Roman law tended in the time of Luther to depress the German peasant into the condition of a Roman slave; nor that there was a "popular opposition" to it; nor that it was a grievance of the peasants and one of the causes of the Revolt of 1525. These ideas are of the nature of a legend which has grown up in later centuries, due partly to a confusion of peasant conditions east and west of the Elbe, partly to a nationalistic German feeling, and partly to unwarranted generalizations and an uncritical dependence of one secondary authority upon another.

SIDNEY BRADSHAW FAY.

individuals and whole villages from a free into an unfree condition, as could be proved by hundreds of documents and has been proved, for instance, by Arndt in regard to Pomerania. These juristic upstarts were the most zealous agents of the lords' usurpations and encroachments. They either misunderstood or purposely ignored and distorted the old German conditions. If they found in the case of a free rent-paying peasant a single indication which has any resemblance to *Leibeigenschaft* . . . they forthwith applied to him the Roman law of Slavery." Zimmermann does not, however, cite a single one of these "hundreds of documents". His only evidence for these sweeping generalizations is the combination of a quotation from Murner's "Gild of Rogues" (for its value cf. above, notes 48-51) with an indefinite reference to Ernst Moritz Arndt's *Geschichte der Leibeigenschaft in Pommern und Rügen* (Berlin, 1803). This is a good little book in which Arndt describes the terrible depression of the Pomeranian peasantry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and in which he quotes the depressing Romanistic theories of Mevius (1646) and Balthasar (1779), two followers of Husanus; he holds these to be directly responsible in part for the Pomeranian peasant's unhappy lot.

"It is not, of course, simply the alleged effect of the Roman law on the peasant which is the basis of his attack on the Roman law; he has many other reasons for regarding it as "heathenish" and generally harmful in contrast to the "Christian" German law (cf. I. 474 seq.).

HORACE WALPOLE'S MEMOIRS OF THE REIGN OF GEORGE THE THIRD, I.

WHAT may be called the Whig view of the reign of George III. is as familiar to Americans as the traditional notion of the Revolution, of which it is, indeed, an integral part: the king ascended the throne with the fixed intention of overthrowing English constitutional liberty and of restoring the prerogative to its former high position; in this attempt he was steadily supported by the Scots and the Tories, and resisted as steadily by the Whigs; the attempt to subject the colonies to the crown was part of this deep-laid scheme; nevertheless, the king failed finally because of the assistance which the Whigs in America gave to their brethren in England, and thus, as Pitt professed to have conquered America in Germany, English patriots vanquished their king at Yorktown. An interpretation so flattering to national pride was bound to find ready acceptance in America, while to the English Whigs of the Reform Bill period it was almost equally attractive; it hardly needed the solemn pronouncements of Bancroft or the glitter of Macaulay's rhetoric to give it all the appearance of an axiomatic truth.

The theory is to be found, of course, in newspapers and party pamphlets from the time of the Stamp Act. These, however, even Whig historians would regard with suspicious eye. But in 1845, the year after Macaulay's second essay on Chatham appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, there was published in England a work which seemed to give to the Whig contention the support of solid contemporary evidence, inasmuch as it indicated that the designs of the king were apparent to unprejudiced observers from the beginning of his reign. Horace Walpole's *Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third* professed to have been written between the years 1766 and 1772. The author was a member of Parliament, a friend of men in power and out, a close observer, an indefatigable note-taker, a lively gossip, and a successful ferreter-out of secrets. He pretended to be indifferent to all parties, a mere dabbler in bric-a-brac who recorded impartially, for the edification of posterity, the tale of passing events. And yet the theory of the *Memoirs*, in so far as they present any general interpretation of the reign, is the Whig theory; and one might suppose, if the mere matter of chronology

did not forbid it, that Macaulay came fresh from reading Walpole when he sat down to write the essay on Chatham.¹

It is quite true that Walpole was not accepted as an oracle by the Whigs any more than by the Tories. Macaulay, at least, would scarcely have relished being told that his own work embodied the opinions of the man whom he had already called a fool in as many balanced sentences as his copious vocabulary could furnish forth.² Of the Memoirs themselves, indeed, he said nothing, leaving it to the amiable Croker to tell the world that Walpole was actuated by nothing but vanity and cupidity, and that he wrote, besides, in bad temper.³ Nevertheless, the Memoirs were favorably reviewed in *Blackwood's*⁴ at the time of their publication, and half a century later Leslie Stephen took occasion to call them "good old-fashioned history", comparing them, to their great advantage, with the "fashion now prevalent, in which six portly folios are allotted to a year, and an event takes longer to describe than to occur".⁵ A new edition of the Memoirs in 1894,⁶ and of the letters in 1903,⁷ together with the reviews they called forth, have in a measure completed the rehabilitation of Walpole's works as historical sources of first-rate importance. I believe that they are so indeed. Whether the letters are worth more or less, in that respect, than the Memoirs is perhaps an open question, but one which need not be considered here. It may, however, be worth while to consider whether the Memoirs, since they contain what I have called the Whig view of the reign of George III., are precisely what they profess to be. To what extent are they contemporaneous with the events they chronicle?

The memoirs cover the period from the accession of George III., October 25, 1760, to the death of the princess dowager in 1772. Walpole says he began the Memoirs August 18, 1766.⁸ During the

¹ Macaulay was of course familiar with Walpole's letters, which, after 1775, express the Whig view even more clearly than the Memoirs. Macaulay's famous saying about Tories being fools may have come from Walpole. "A Whig may be a fool, a Tory must be so", etc. *Letters*, X. 273. Leslie Stephen asserts that much of Walpole's light has been "transfused" through the pages of Macaulay. *Hours in a Library*, II. 156.

² Cf. Macaulay's review of the letters to Mann. *Essays* (Longmans, 1898), II. 314.

³ *Quarterly Review*, LXXVII. 136.

⁴ LVII. 353.

⁵ *Hours in a Library*, II. 154.

⁶ By G. F. Russell Barker, in four volumes. (London: Lawrence and Bullen; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.) The citations in this article are to this edition.

⁷ By Mrs. Paget Toynbee, in sixteen volumes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1903-1905.) The citations in this article are to this edition.

⁸ *Notes of my Life*, printed in the preface of Mrs. Paget Toynbee's edition of the *Letters*.

next two years he did little, apparently, for at the close of 1768 he was still writing the first volume, having brought the narrative down only to March, 1764.⁹ In January, 1769, the second volume was under way, and he was occupied with the events of the winter of 1765.¹⁰ In July and August of 1769, we are told, he "finished two more books of my Memoirs for the years 1765, 1766".¹¹ In October, 1769, he was narrating the events of March, 1767, having nearly completed the second volume.¹² When he reached the end of the first Parliament of George III., March, 1768, which brought him to the end of chapter six of volume three, Walpole threw the work aside, having tired of it, and he did not know whether he would ever take it up again.¹³ However, he did take it up again after the peace with Spain in 1771,¹⁴ and completed the work sometime in 1772.¹⁵ The larger part of the original draft was thus written in 1768-1769 and 1771-1772; and the editors¹⁶ have left us to infer that the printed Memoirs are the same as the original draft which Walpole completed at that time. Such, however, is not the case. The original draft was revised as late as 1784, and evidence of this fact, which is as plain as printed dates can make it, is scattered from one end of the book to the other.

In the first place, many of the foot-notes with which Walpole supplemented the text allude to events that enable us to fix their composition subsequent to the composition of the original draft: some refer to dates earlier than 1772 but later than the date of the composition of the particular part of the text to which they are appended;¹⁷ many refer to events subsequent to the year 1772; as, for example, to 1773, 1774, or 1775,¹⁸ to the entrance of France into the American war,¹⁹ to the loss of the colonies, or to the years 1783-

⁹ *Memoirs*, I. 310.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II. 53.

¹¹ *Notes of my Life*.

¹² *Memoirs*, II. 308.

¹³ *Ibid.*, III. 107.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

¹⁵ *Notes of my Life*.

¹⁶ The Memoirs were first edited by Denis Le Marchant, who says in his preface that they were "printed exactly as the author left them, except that it has been thought right to suppress a few passages of indecent tendency". Mr. Barker printed his edition from the Le Marchant text and inserted most of the notes of Le Marchant. Yet he says nothing as to the time of writing the Memoirs except that "Walpole commenced the task of writing the Memoirs . . . on 18th August 1766, and finished them in 1772." Preface, p. xx.

¹⁷ *Memoirs*, I. 139, 242, 281, 289; II. 11, 67.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, I. 113, 183; II. 191, 231, 237, 272, 280, 301; III. 24; IV. 13, 167, 169.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, II. 63; III. 253.

1784,²⁰ and there is one note that refers to the year 1786,²¹ and two that refer to the year 1788.²²

The revision of the *Memoirs* was not confined to the notes, however. In the third volume, page 24, there is a note in which Walpole says that the attempt to impose taxes on America has caused a civil war there, "whence is just arrived notice of the first bloodshed, as I transcribe these *Memoirs*—in June, 1775". In volume four, page 83, there is the following note: "This paragraph, from the words *and was disabled*, was added in July, 1784." These are the only references to any revision of the *Memoirs* that Walpole himself anywhere makes; and it might be inferred, therefore, that he simply copied out the original draft in 1775 and added part of a paragraph and some notes in 1784. But it is clear that the single paragraph which Walpole says was inserted in 1784 is not the only one inserted at that time, and it is probable that some insertions were made during the "transcribing" of 1775. Let us establish these points.

First, there are a number of passages, inserted after the original draft was finished in 1772, that may have been inserted in 1775. Volume one, page 16: "the revenues of the Crown were so soon squandered in purchasing dependants, that architecture, the darling art of Lord Bute, was contracted from the erection of a new palace to altering a single door-case in the drawing-room at St. James's." This part of the *Memoirs* was originally written in 1766, yet the palace which the king designed to build was not given up till 1771, as Walpole himself says in volume four, page 205. Volume one, page 164, originally written before 1769, contains a reference to Lord Kinnoul, who "came no more to London till the year 1770". Volume two, page 291: Lord Chatham "appeared no more in the House of Lords, really becoming that invisible and inaccessible divinity which Burke has described". This I suppose to refer to the speech on American Taxation, in which Burke paid his famous tribute to Lord Chatham. Volume three, page 21: Townshend's revenue plan of March, 1767, was adopted by the House "before it had been well weighed, and the fatal consequences of which did not break out till six years after". Volume four, page 18: "In 1775, on the Princesse de Lamballe being placed above the Princesse de Chimay", etc.

Second, the paragraph which Walpole takes pains to specify as being added in 1784 is not the only one that was added at that time. Volume four, page 54: "Lord North's conduct in the American war

²⁰ *Memoirs*, I. 305; II. 116, 242, 321; III. 24; IV. 69, 88, 92, 118, 142, 149, 154.

²¹ *Ibid.*, I. 305.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 22, 86.

displayed all these features. He engaged in it against his opinion, and yet without reluctance. He managed it without foresight or address, and was neither ashamed when it miscarried, nor dispirited when the Crown itself became endangered by the additional war with France." Volume four, page 76: the king "not only preferred his personal influence to that of England, but risked, exposed, and lost a most important portion of his dominions". Volume four, page 85: "the subsequent transactions to the commencement of the new Parliament in 1784 have but corroborated my ideas. . . . the overt acts of the American war have but too sadly realized the more problematic suspicions I had entertained of the evil designs of the Court . . . and a more undisguised attempt in the Crown of governing independently having distinguished the year 1784", etc. Volume four, page 157: the king "lost his dominions in America . . . by aiming at despotism in England". Volume four, page 163: the court, "by a series of wretched measures . . . lost at once our colonies in America, and the empire of the ocean everywhere".

It is thus clear that Walpole inserted new matter in the *Memoirs* after the completion of the original draft in 1772. But we do not yet know whether he inserted much or little, or whether the insertions changed the character of the *Memoirs* in any important respect. These questions are more important than the questions already considered, as well as more difficult to answer. My own opinion is that the additions, though not considerable in amount perhaps, modified in an important way the interpretation of the reign of George III. embodied in the original draft. Besides the passages quoted above, there are others that express opinions very different from those we know Walpole held at the time the original draft was written; and in the case of some of these passages there is internal evidence confirming the supposition that they were inserted at a later time. These passages cannot be considered intelligently, however, until we know, independently of the *Memoirs*, what Walpole's opinions were at the time when he was writing the original draft and at the time when he was making the revision. Fortunately, Walpole was a confirmed letter-writer, and his letters, in the elaborate new edition of Mrs. Paget Toynbee, constitute what is practically a daily journal of events and of Walpole's opinions about them. It will be well, therefore, to sketch briefly, on the basis of the letters, what may be called the development of Walpole's political opinions—his strictly contemporaneous interpretation of the events of the reign of George III. But before doing this, it will not be out of place, since the letters are to furnish the material, to say a few words about the letters themselves as reliable sources of information.

Walpole says in one place that he does not write letters for amusement, but in expectation of returns.²³ Still, as he got few and unsatisfactory returns, the statement must be discounted. He wrote letters partly in expectation of returns no doubt, but also partly for amusement, and partly to produce an effect: it pleased him not so much to communicate information to his friends as to convince them that he knew a great deal worth communicating, and knew it at a very early hour—before it happened, if possible. This very desire, of course, inclined him to be accurate: he liked to tell his friends—Conway, and Hertford, and Sir Horace Mann—what they ought to do, and then have it turn out afterward that they ought in fact to have done just that. “Recollect that I understand this country pretty well,—attend closely to what passes,—have very good intelligence,—and know the characters of the actors thoroughly”, he writes to Hertford.²⁴ Yet he warns him, too: “I tell you what I *hear*, and do not answer for truth but when I tell you what I *know*.”²⁵ And the fact is that the letters no less than the Memoirs must be used with some caution. Walpole more than most people perhaps regarded the person to whom he was writing and not infrequently wrote what was in his correspondent’s mind to hear rather than what, strictly, was in his own to say. The fulsome letters to Voltaire are instances in point.²⁶ They are what Walpole himself called “civil” letters.²⁷ The ethics of letter-writing was indeed not high in the eighteenth century, and Walpole was not above forging the name of the King of Prussia for the purpose of playing what would now be regarded, at the very least, as a contemptible practical joke on Rousseau.²⁸ To be sure, these were not his friends. But even in his letters to Sir Horace Mann he kept in mind the official connections of that gentleman, and often wrote accordingly.²⁹ The most important consideration, however, in this respect is the insecurity of the public post of that day. “I firmly believe every tittle I have uttered”, he writes to Mann.³⁰ “Never have I deceived you

²³ *Letters*, V. 165.

²⁴ May 24, 1765. *Ibid.*, VI. 244.

²⁵ April 5, 1764. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, VII. 199, 206.

²⁷ *Notes of my Life*. In a letter to Thomas Walpole, he says that the return of Temple “will greatly facilitate everything”. *Letters*, VII. 24. This was intended for the eye of William Pitt. But cf. the letter to Mann. *Ibid.*, VII. 32. Walpole wrote, in like manner, “civil” letters to Hume, Grafton, Newcastle, and others. Cf. *ibid.*, V. 382; VI. 301, 332; X. 27.

²⁸ For Walpole’s justification of the letter, see *Letters*, VII. 31, 66, 68. The affair is treated at length by Morley. *Rousseau*, II. 287.

²⁹ *Letters*, V. 77; VI. 64; IX. 276.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, X. 435.

knowingly. I mean, when I have written by a safe hand—by the post, one colours over some things, even because one's letters may be opened by 'foreign enemies.' On the accession of Conway to office, he writes joyously:³¹ "This is the first moment that I have enjoyed *the liberty of the post* for these three years. We may say what we will; I may launch out, and even *you* need not be discreet, when our letters pass through *Mr. Conway's office*." The letters contain ample evidence, indeed, that Walpole wrote freely on political matters only when his letters were conveyed by private hand.³²

With these facts in mind, one may gather from the letters an accurate enough idea of Walpole's political opinions. Not much credit need be given to the statement, often repeated, that he cares nothing about politics, is indifferent to both parties, and wishes only to retire to Strawberry and solitude. It is plain that he cannot retire, except when the gout compels him, but must be always running up to London when Parliament is in session. The son of Robert Walpole loved "big politics" and "thundering revolutions", and would have liked nothing better than to be in the centre of the stage.³³ But he was not in the centre of the stage—was hardly, except once, even in the wings—and not being there, was determined above everything that no one should suppose he cared two straws about it. In fact, Walpole was an Englishman to the core, and for what he considered the welfare of England he cared immensely—more, perhaps, than he was himself aware.³⁴

The welfare of England, indeed, in Walpole's eyes, was often threatened. England had always her evil genius, and her history was mainly a decline and fall from the golden age of Sir Robert's administration.³⁵ During the reign of George II., this evil genius was the house of Pelham, which had replaced the house of Walpole. Therefore he admired Pitt as minister, though he had had only sar-

³¹ *Letters*, VI. 265.

³² See especially the long letter to Hertford, January 22, 1764. *Ibid.*, V. 437. Cf. with *ibid.*, p. 406. For further evidence on this point, see *ibid.*, V. 77; VI. 2, 8, 20, 66, 95, 110, 112, 139, 175, 176, 214, 224, 230, 241, 246, 357, 362, 371; VII. 151, 199, 351, 548; VIII. 58; IX. 81, 276; X. 309; XI. 449; XII. 118, 195.

³³ *Ibid.*, VII. 2.

³⁴ "I have hoped or feared; but always in the same spirit—the liberty and happiness of England." *Ibid.*, X. 233. "How many wretches have I lived to see England escape! Thank God I am not philosopher enough not to be grateful for it." *Ibid.*, VI. 446. "Two years ago I meditated leaving England if it was enslaved. I have no such thought now. I will steal into its bosom when my hour comes, and love it to the last." *Ibid.*, X. 285. Many such quotations could be made. Cf. *ibid.*, V. 259; VII. 29, 193, 363.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII. 345; X. 284, 314, 315, 317, 325, 335; XI. 102; XII. 195, 405; XIII. 87, 312, 313.

casms for Pitt as "Patriot", because Pitt seemed inclined to ride rough-shod over the house of Pelham and the whole corrupt aristocracy. For the same reason the attitude of "Leicester House" towards the old king and his ministers was highly amusing. It is thus no gloomy prospect that opens up to Walpole at the accession of George III.³⁶ The existence of a "favorite" does not alarm him;³⁷ and as for the "ambitious designing woman" whom we read of in the *Memoirs*, why, he thinks "no petticoat ever governed less; it is left at Leicester House."³⁸ If the gracious young king, who has such "good dispositions",³⁹ can accomplish what Pitt has only begun, all will be well.⁴⁰ And how much better if he can do this and make peace at the same time; peace is the dearest wish of his heart, and he will be satisfied with even a bad one.⁴¹ Best of all, if the house of Pelham is broken, may not the house of Walpole again count for something?⁴²

From the end of 1762 this bright prospect begins to cloud over a little. The preparations of Lord Bute for carrying the peace do not please him. He cannot see into the storm, is sorry Fox has taken position, thinks Bute's "game" not so easy, and sees him tottering to his fall.⁴³ So little inclination did the administration show towards the house of Walpole that Walpole's own exchequer bills were delayed;⁴⁴ and Fox, failing to bribe him for his vote on the peace, granted the reversion of his place to "young Martin".⁴⁵ Still, Walpole can but rejoice, since peace is made.⁴⁶ In the humiliation of Devonshire, and the drastic treatment of Newcastle's friends, he sniffs "prerogative" to be sure,⁴⁷ but he has long seen the growing power of the aristocracy, and, while not wishing to have the king predominate, is convinced that only the crown can curb the House of Lords, and consoles himself with the thought that perhaps it will

³⁶ "The truth was, I had been civilly treated on the King's accession, and had so much disliked Newcastle and Hardwicke, that few men were better pleased than myself to see a new administration." *Memoirs*, I. 167.

³⁷ *Letters*, IV. 442, 447, 449; V. 2, 11, 16, 29, 35, 211, 213, 218.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, IV. 455.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, V. 46. "The King is good and amiable in everything he does." *Ibid.*, 8; see also, *ibid.*, IV. 449, 455; V. 12.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, IV. 442, 447, 449, 453, 455; V. 3, 9, 10, 12, 47, 141, 207, 208.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, V. 47, 48, 71, 73, 74, 83, 98, 114, 123, 124, 141, 144, 148, 164, 210.

⁴² *Ibid.*, V. 2, 11, 12, 13, 27, 30, 34. Walpole doubtless expected recognition for Waldegrave, who was the king's tutor when Prince of Wales, and a relation of Walpole. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 306, 308.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, V. 261-267, 278, 290.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 288, 292.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 309. Cf. *Memoirs*, I. 168, 169.

⁴⁶ *Letters*, V. 271.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 271, 273, 283.

at last be able to do so.⁴⁸ In any case, there is no danger from prerogative in the hands of men like Bute and Fox, since the plans of five months have been overthrown by a fortnight's panic.⁴⁹ Walpole's ill-humor at this time is not due to any fear for the constitution, but to real or fancied affronts which the ministers had put upon him. In the time of the Wilkes affair of 1763-1764, he nevertheless has his revenge. He is in the best of spirits, and the whole situation appeals to him as subject for Homeric laughter.⁵⁰ To be sure, he would die for the privileges of the House of Commons, and for the liberty of the press; the principle involved is a vital one;⁵¹ but the opposition is so united and the ministry so divided and incompetent that there is not the least danger of arbitrary power.⁵² The letters at this time are a veritable paean of victory; it is a victory in a factional squabble, with serious constitutional questions looming up no doubt, but still low on the horizon and giving little concern.

In April, 1764, the political sky is again overcast. Whig principles are at stake, as they were in 1688.⁵³ But it is not American affairs, which he understands no more than Hebrew,⁵⁴ that occasion the danger; it is the dismissal of Conway for his vote on general warrants.⁵⁵ From now on, Grenville is the man of "rotten heart",⁵⁶ whose ruin Walpole will gladly see. Prerogative is so far from being a danger that it is itself in danger. The Regency Bill arrayed Bute and Holland against Grenville and Bedford, and Walpole hopes Bute will win—would, if he were Bute, deliver himself bound hand and foot to Pitt rather than submit to such wretches as Grenville.⁵⁷ He sees with apprehension all the great families arrayed on one side or the other. It is again a scene of Bohuns, Montforts, and Plantagenets.⁵⁸ In the midst of these struggles the king is insulted and his family disgraced.⁵⁹ The mob rises and civil war threatens.⁶⁰ It is not the prerogative but the aristocracy and the mob that Walpole fears: prerogative is "grown so tame that you may stroke him".⁶¹

⁴⁸ *Letters*, V. 273.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 301, 304, 312.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 294, 320, 322, 389, 391, 396.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 384, 400.

⁵² *Ibid.*, V. 452, cf. 438; VI. 7, 12.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, VI. 97.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 168, 186.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 61, 117.

⁵⁶ Expression used in the *Memoirs*, I. 215. Cf. *Letters*, V. 437.

⁵⁷ *Letters*, VI. 214, 219-223, 225-228, 229, 231.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 247, 249, 250.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 238-241, 243.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

In July, 1765, the "great and happy change" to the Rockingham ministry is effected.⁶² The four tyrants are gone,⁶³ and Walpole, having worked night and day to get his friends in, runs off to Paris for a holiday, sore indeed that he has no recognition for his pains, but satisfied at least that the constitution is in safe hands.⁶⁴ True, Pitt does strange things, such as declaring against the right of Parliament to tax America,⁶⁵ and Bute shows a tendency at times to negotiate with Grenville.⁶⁶ But on the whole Bute and the king remain firm for the ministry, and when Pitt comes in the prospect for a strong and stable government is excellent.⁶⁷ The repeal of the Stamp Act pleases Walpole because it is "satisfactory for the Ministry" and because it puts Grenville "in the mire".⁶⁸ At the end of 1767, in spite of "unpleasing" accounts from America—Massachusetts Bay having "irreverently" assumed the powers of Parliament⁶⁹—and although Rockingham stupidly joins the rogue Grenville,⁷⁰ and Temple has a long foot for kicking up a dust,⁷¹ the ministry is nevertheless still firm, opposition "scarce barks", America is "pacified";⁷² these times, in fact, interesting now, will hereafter appear "most inconsiderable".⁷³

The next year Wilkes reappears. Walpole thinks he will sink in contempt, but still the mob spirit waxes strong, and he is sorry to see a wealthy nation running riot.⁷⁴ America, too, is a "disagreeable prospect", but he never reads the reports and is glad to have nothing to do with that affair.⁷⁵ In 1769 Wilkes is finally expelled and Walpole sees controversies of a hundred years ago revive.⁷⁶ In May Wilkes seems altogether forgotten, but in November and December the rage for petitioning brings him to the front again, and Walpole is once more exercised for the safety of the constitution, which the mob is now led on to destroy. Yet he consoles himself with the thought that he has seen the Pretender at Derby, and the Lords striding to power at the close of the last reign and the king

⁶² *Letters*, VI. 264.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 266, 294, 303, 311, 330, 337, 343, 351, 362-364.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 417, 418, 421.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, VII. 30, 32, 78, 84, 86, 89, 92, 95, 96.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, VI. 445, 446.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, VII. 100, 102.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 119, 122, 123, 141, 147.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 184, 186, 187, 188, 196, 197, 204.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 208, 217, 226, 235, 247.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 253, 257, 268.

at the beginning of this; and why should the people, less formidable than either the king or the aristocracy, succeed where they have failed? These vacillations doubtless only show the excellent poise of the constitution after all.⁷⁷ And so, sure enough, it turned out. Chatham can no longer charm in the Lords; opposition fails likewise in the Commons; the mighty bluster of petitions ends happily, and civil war gives place to subscription masquerades.⁷⁸

Through the years 1771-1772, Walpole was convinced that the safety of the constitution depended upon the success of the court. With the accession of Lord North in February, 1770, the prospect was much improved. Of Lord North, indeed, Walpole has a high opinion: he is active, assiduous, resolute, and fitted to deal with mankind; he has "very good parts, quickness, great knowledge"; he sees that it is much easier "for a King of England to disarm the minds of his subjects than their hands".⁷⁹ In fact North carried them through a serious crisis, and before the end of 1770 Walpole was able to record with pleasure that the spirit of martyrdom was pretty well burnt out, that Wilkes had finally failed, and that the opposition was crumbling away.⁸⁰ The treaty with Spain "is an epoch; and puts a total end to all our preceding histories".⁸¹ "For my part, I reckon the volume quite shut in which I took any interest. The succeeding world is young, new, and half unknown to me."⁸² "Thus all our storms are blown over, except in Ireland, and that does not seem to threaten much. . . . What ten years of vexation might have been avoided if folks would have adhered to my father's maxim of *Quieta non movere!*"⁸³ Through the quiet years from 1771 to 1773 Walpole maintains the same attitude. In June, 1773, he hopes Lord North will not resign, for "he is an honest and a moderate man".⁸⁴ The "insurrection in the Massachusetts" concerns him not at all; he cares only for the present, and the present is very calm.⁸⁵ As late as February, 1774, he can say no more than that "if all the black slaves were in rebellion, I should have no doubt in choosing my side, but I scarce wish perfect freedom to merchants who are the bloodiest of all tyrants."⁸⁶

⁷⁷ *Letters*, VII. 280, 328, 343, 345, 347.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 249, 349, 359, 366.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 371, cf. 361-363, 368, 372, 375-378.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 383, 386, 387, 418-420.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, VIII. 12.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

From this account of Walpole's political opinions during the time he was writing the original draft of the *Memoirs*, there emerge, I think, four important points. (1) Walpole was an old-fashioned Whig,⁸⁷ who believed that the safety of the state depended upon maintaining a proper balance between the three parts of the constitution—king, Lords, and Commons. He feared anything which tended to disturb this balance. (2) He had no settled convictions during this period that either king, Lords, or Commons was steadily growing in power; it was now the crown, now the aristocracy, and now the mob that he feared. (3) So far from perceiving any settled plan on the part of the king for increasing the prerogative, the danger from the crown was the least of the three; the only time the crown seemed to predominate was in 1762–1763, before he began to write the *Memoirs*; during the whole time he was writing the *Memoirs*, what he most feared was the factional strife of the great families on the one hand, and the mob spirit stirred up by the merchants or intriguing politicians on the other. The king was to be pitied for his weakness rather than feared for his strength. (4) Walpole's vacillation in these matters was due in no small measure to personal interests. The man or faction that stood in the way of what he wanted for his friends, or thought necessary for any reason, became straightway a danger to the constitution; the same man or faction aiding, was its friend. Of all his fears and animosities, the king, Bute, the Scots, the Tories, the princess, and Lord North were on the whole the least.

With the outbreak of the American war, however, there came a striking change in Walpole's point of view. It was in June, 1775, when he reached page 24 of the third volume in the "transcribing" of 1775 that he learned of the first bloodshed. This is almost precisely the period when he first took a definite stand as to that event; and from this date his opinions never change.⁸⁸ He regards the Americans as his countrymen who are fighting for liberty against the attempt of the king, aided by the Scots and the Tories, to establish despotism over the whole empire. The house of Hanover is playing the same game that the house of Stuart formerly tried to play. The king has staked all against the hope of absolute power, and the nation, deluded by the ministry, is working for its own ruin.

⁸⁷ Walpole called himself an old-fashioned Whig. *Letters*, X. 262, 273; XII. 284, 285; XIII. 86.

⁸⁸ The first letter in the decided tone that prevails throughout the war is to Mann, September, 11, 1775. "What a paragraph of blood is there!", etc. *Letters*, IX. 247. Cf. this with the earlier letters of 1774 and 1775. *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 99, 106, 109, 127, 133, 153, 227.

Whether the government succeeded or failed, the result would be ruin: in the one case, liberty was gone; in the other, commercial empire. He blushes to be an Englishman, a countryman of the majority, and can no longer love what does not deserve esteem. To have squandered away such an empire for the hope of despotic power was the maddest project yet attempted by English kings; and when America wins, Walpole rejoices that she at least will be free though England may not be. The famous resolution of April 6, 1780, he adopts as a part of his Revolution creed, and would have added to Magna Carta that whenever the influence of the crown "has increased and is increasing, it ought to be diminished".⁸⁹ During the eight years of the war these ideas are repeated over and over again, and in a tone of bitterness and reviling that not infrequently borders on frenzy. The danger from the aristocracy and the mob has altogether disappeared; the king and his tools, the Scots, the Tories, and the clergy, now loom so large that they fill the entire field of vision.⁹⁰

We may now proceed to examine some passages in the Memoirs for the purpose of determining the probable extent of the revision. It is obvious to begin with that the opinions expressed in the letters will be of use only with respect to the revision of 1784, since there was no marked change in Walpole's opinions until after the revision of 1775 had been largely accomplished.⁹¹ But wherever opinions in the Memoirs disagree with those of the letters before 1775, and at the same time correspond closely with the opinions of the letters after 1775, it may be assumed that the passage in question was inserted during the revision of 1784, both because the letters after 1775 differ so greatly from those before that date, and because the passages in the Memoirs which we know were inserted in 1784 do in fact correspond closely with the letters of the later date. Now it will be recalled that all the passages which we know positively to have been inserted in 1784 are found in the fourth volume. This fact suggests that possibly the revision of 1784 was confined to that volume. It will be well, therefore, to take up those passages in the last volume that show evidence of revision, before taking up any in the first three.

⁸⁹ *Letters*, XI. 149.

⁹⁰ The following references are a few of the many that might be given. *Ibid.*, IX. 244, 247, 266, 274, 278, 342, 369; X. 9, 10, 49, 129, 163, 166, 191, 262, 421, 432; XI. 30, 43, 121, 149, 222, 232, 414; XII. 72, 141, 178, 183, 195, 204, 320, 412; XIII. 86, 131, 255. The effect of the war upon Walpole's opinion of North, Bute, Burke, Pitt, and especially of everything Scotch, may be seen in the following. *Ibid.*, X. 207, 233, 260, 284, 311, 328; XI. 21, 30, 222, 235, 376, 384; XII. 72, 118, 183, 245, 288, 420.

⁹¹ Recall that Walpole had reached page 24 of volume three in the first revision, in June, 1775. *Memoirs*, III. 24. And for his opinion on the war at that time, see references given in note 88 above.

One of the most striking changes in Walpole's opinions was in respect to Lord North, and the Memoirs reflect this change so perfectly that one has little difficulty in distinguishing the later insertions from the original draft. It is at page 50 of the fourth volume that Walpole first takes up the North ministry, and we find to begin with that "Lord North had neither connections with the nobility, nor popularity with the country, yet he undertook the Government in a manly style." He "plunged boldly into the danger at once. . . . If the Court should be beaten, the King would be at the mercy of the Opposition, or driven to have recourse to the Lords—possibly to the sword. All the resolutions on the Middlesex election would be rescinded, the Parliament dissolved, or the contest reduced to the sole question of prerogative. Yet in the short interval allowed, Lord North . . . the Scotch and the Butists . . . had been so active . . . that at past twelve at night the Court proved victorious." This is precisely in the tone of the letters of 1770—might, indeed, have been copied from them almost word for word.⁹² At page 52, however, Walpole begins a long description of North which, opening with some remarks that might have been part of the original draft, rapidly takes on the tone of 1784. The first nine lines are devoted to a brilliant description of North's personal appearance, which, Walpole says, "disgusted all who judge by appearance, or withhold their approbation till it is courted. But within that rude casket were enclosed many useful talents. He had much wit, good-humour, strong natural sense, assurance, and promptness, both of conception and elocution [execution?]. His ambition had seemed to aspire to the height, yet he was not very ambitious. He was thought interested, yet was not avaricious." All this sounds much like the letters of 1770; but from this point a different tone begins to appear.

He had lent himself readily to all the violences of Mr. Grenville against Wilkes . . . and with equal alacrity had served under the Duke of Grafton . . . It was in truth worth his ambition, though he should rule but a day, to attain the rank of Prime Minister. He . . . seemed to have all necessary activity till he reached the summit. Yet that industry ceased when it became most requisite. He had neither system, nor principles, nor shame; sought neither the favour of the Crown or of the people, but enjoyed the good luck of fortune with a gluttonous epicurism that was equally careless of glory and disgrace. His indolence prevented his forming any plan. His indifference made him leap from one extreme to another; and his insensibility to reproach reconciled him to any contradiction. He proved as indolent as the Duke of Grafton, but . . . he was less hurt at capital disgraces than the Duke had been at trifling difficulties.

Then comes the passage already quoted: "Lord North's conduct in

⁹² *Letters*, VII. 362, 364, 372.

the American war displayed all these features"; and there are two pages more of the same kind of comment.⁹³

Immediately following the description of North, there is a paragraph devoted to the other ministers, which was obviously written at the same time; the tone is very bitter, and Elliot and Dyson are mentioned as having died during the American war. The paragraph at page 57 belongs to the same period, I think, for Walpole mentions with regret that although the "Ministers were teased within, and the King from without, Lord Chatham was always baffled in the Lords, Dowdeswell, Burke, and Grenville in the Commons; nor could Wilkes in the City keep up more than an ineffectual flame." In the letters, on the contrary, Walpole records with pleasure that the court is successful in spite of the efforts of Chatham in the Lords, of the Opposition in the Commons, and of Wilkes in the City.⁹⁴ From this point the Memoirs return to the manner of 1771, which prevails until page 70, where the Luttrell affair is summed up as "a speaking lesson to Princes and Ministers not to stretch the strings of prerogative! The whole reign of George the Third was a standing sermon of the same kind; and the mortifications I have been recounting were but slight bruises compared to the wounds he afterwards received."⁹⁵

At page 83 we come to the paragraph to which is appended the note already quoted: "This paragraph, from the words *and was disabled*, was added in July 1784." From the words indicated to the end of the paragraph is a matter of only nine lines. But it is clear that not only these nine lines but the two following paragraphs to the top of page 86 were added at the same time. At the point where Walpole has appended the note quoted above the text reads as follows: "The truth of these observations will appear from some remarks that I think it necessary to make on a pamphlet which made much noise at the time of which I am writing, and the effects of which, though the treatise may be forgotten, are felt at this day, that essay having operated considerably towards dividing . . . the Opposition, which afterwards . . . was reduced to the shadow of resistance, and was disabled", etc. The rest of the paragraph and the two following are devoted to a diatribe on the danger from the prerogative, the insidious designs of the king, and the lessons of the American war. It is only at page 85 that we finally learn the title of the pamphlet about which he wishes to make some remarks. The transition comes in the middle of a paragraph, and is abrupt enough to justify quot-

⁹³ Cf. *Letters*, XII. 245, 420.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, VII. 349.

⁹⁵ Cf. this with *ibid.*, VII. 345.

ing. "He [the author] has written prodigiously too much, if no man shall be the wiser for his writings. He laments not his pains, nor shall deprecate censure if a single person becomes a real patriot, or a better citizen from perusing this work—of which he himself is heartily tired. Mr. Edmund Burke had published, on the 23rd of April, a long and laborious pamphlet, called *Thoughts on the Present Discontents*", etc.⁹⁶

A final example from the fourth volume will suffice. At the top of page 157, Walpole says: "Still was the surprise of mankind extreme, when, on the 16th, it was known that Lord Weymouth had resigned the Seals—a mysterious conduct, increased by his own obstinate silence", etc. In the next few lines, Walpole explains that the resignation probably did not mean that Weymouth would go into opposition, for a lucrative place was at once granted to his brother; "the weak measures of the Court having reduced them to be afraid of a man who had quitted them only from fear". Having said that the resignation was "mysterious", Walpole now says that it was

⁹⁶ The whole paragraph on page 83, the one to which Walpole has appended the note quoted above, shows some indications of having been written partly in 1771–1772, partly in 1775, and partly in 1784. The paragraph begins on page 82, thus: "Those vague and unconcerted attacks wore out the spirit of redress, instead of keeping up its zeal. The several factions hated each other more than they did their common enemies, and most of the leaders of Opposition had, in their time, contributed to the grievances of which they now complained. It must, I think, appear evident, from the scope of the reign, that the Princess Dowager and Lord Bute had assumed the reins with a fixed intention of raising the prerogative", etc. There seems little connection between the last sentence and the one preceding. The theme of the princess and Bute and the prerogative is elaborated for a page, until, in the middle of page 83, we come to the sentence already quoted: "The truth of these observations", etc. Now, the "remarks" which Walpole finally (p. 86) makes on Burke's pamphlet do not confirm the "observations" just made on the princess, Bute, and the prerogative, but go to show that the real evils of which Burke complained—the "Discontents"—had their origin in the factional struggles of the reign of George II.; the "remarks" which Walpole makes, that is, confirm the truth of the first two sentences of the paragraph, that "most of the leaders of Opposition had, in their time, contributed to the grievances of which they now complained." Further, Walpole says that though the pamphlet in question may be forgotten, its effects are "felt at this day". He would hardly have said that, if writing in 1771–1772, for the pamphlet was published in 1770. If, however, Walpole was writing in 1775, the expression would be perfectly natural. I think it very likely that the original draft ran as follows. "... and most of the leaders of Opposition had, in their time, contributed to the grievances of which they now complained. [Insertion of 1784 to middle of page 83.] The truth of these observations will appear from some remarks that I think it necessary to make on a pamphlet which made much noise at the time of which I am writing, and the effects of which [insertion of clause 1775] operated considerably towards dividing, and consequently weakening the Opposition. [Clause to "resistance" inserted, 1775.] [Two pages inserted in 1784.] Mr. Edmund Burke had published, on the 23rd of April", etc.

due to fear. The next sentence is: "Such was the complexion of the King's whole conduct", and the rest of the paragraph is devoted to explaining that such conduct ended in the loss of the American colonies. The next paragraph begins: "The secret motives of Lord Weymouth's resignation were these"; and the paragraph is devoted to explaining what he has just said was "mysterious". The explanation given is that Weymouth, thinking that the king favored war with Spain, had gone in for it strongly, and, supported by Wood, had thrown "every damp on the negotiation"; but when North and the Scots, fearing the return of Chatham in case of war, brought the king back to a peace policy, Weymouth, "who would not have hesitated to change his language had he thought peace could be effected, chose rather to waive his ambition than his security", and resigned. Thus Walpole understands perfectly the conduct of Weymouth and knows perfectly that Wood encouraged him in favoring war. From this point, five pages follow, in which Walpole describes Weymouth at length in order that it may be understood hereafter how such a man could be the "hinge on which so important a crisis turned". This digression ends at page 163 with a reference to the loss of "our colonies in America, and the empire of the ocean everywhere". The very next paragraph begins: "I return to Lord Weymouth's resignation." Why return to it, when it had been so fully discussed? For the purpose, apparently, of explaining it once more, or rather of offering a few inconclusive conjectures on the subject. Here we learn that Weymouth, "*Lord Chatham's friends asserted*, had advised making reprisals on Spain: whether authorized or prompted by Wood, and whether to drive the resigner into opposition, I know not. Certain it is, that he had advised recalling Mr. Harris, our Minister, from Madrid", etc. Thus the resignation has again become the "mysterious" affair that Walpole asserted it to be on page 157; Weymouth's attitude on the Spanish war rests on the assertion of Chatham's friends; and Wood's part in the matter is not known. Yet between page 157 and page 163 Walpole has explained all these points with great precision. If we cut out everything from the words "nor should resign with him", on page 157, to the words "*Lord Chatham's friends asserted*", on page 163, and insert after the word "asserted" the words "that he had", the continuity and consistency of the whole is perfect.

These are not the only passages in the fourth volume that show evidence of having been inserted in 1784; but they are the most important ones, and the only ones, perhaps, with respect to which the evidence is altogether convincing.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ Cf., for example, *Memoirs*, IV. 1, with *Letters*, VII. 345.

It has now been shown that the *Memoirs* were revised as late as 1784, and that in this revision a considerable amount of new material was inserted in the fourth volume; a more difficult question now presents itself—was the revision of 1784 confined to the fourth volume? To what extent the first three volumes were revised in 1784, and the general significance of the revision as a whole, will be considered in the second part of this article.

CARL BECKER.

THE BRITISH ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OREGON QUESTION, 1815-1846

THE Oregon question, which agitated the minds of our people for nearly a generation, bore, like most international problems, a double set of characteristics, the one theoretical, the other practical. Theoretically, it was a question which of two nations, the United States or Great Britain, would succeed in establishing its sovereignty over the region west of the Rocky Mountains, stretching from California in the south to Alaska in the north, or from the parallel of forty-two degrees to the line of fifty-four degrees and forty minutes. Practically, the problem was to determine in what manner and on what principles the territory should be shared by the two claimant states—in common parlance, a boundary question.

At the time when the issue was first joined, 1815, each of the two nations had an honestly acquired interest in that country based on historical developments of no slight importance. Great Britain entered first, through the door of maritime exploration and the deep-sea fur-trade, both of which activities were inaugurated, so far as the Northwest Coast is concerned, by Captain James Cook in his celebrated Third Voyage.¹ Cook's leading object was to discover a passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic; this—had it proved attainable—would have crowned the policy, already well developed, of making the Pacific, with its teeming islands, numerous primitive peoples, and the circumjacent nations of the Orient, a trade preserve of Great Britain.² It would probably have determined the political destiny of the Northwest Coast. In the space of fifteen years, dating from Cook's voyage, British navigators were ready to give the world a fairly complete map of that coast, the result in part of surveys ordered by the government and in part of more or less systematic observations made in the course of trade.³ During the same inter-

¹ See Cook's *Voyage*, 1776-1780 (London, 1784).

² See on the evolution of Britain's policy of exploring the Pacific, the present author's paper entitled "The Acquisition of Oregon, Part I., Exploration and Discovery", in the *Bulletin of the University of Oregon*, new series, vol. VI, no. 3, December, 1908.

³ See Vancouver's map (*Voyages*, London, 1799) which includes results partly published previously in the *Voyages* of Portlock, Dixon, and Meares. Vancouver had been directed to the mouth of the Columbia by Gray, an American trader who entered the river May 11, 1792; Spanish navigators co-operated with him in the mapping of the Puget Sound region.

val, British subjects in Canada, concerned with the extension of the inland fur-trade, pushed their commercial frontier into the Rocky Mountains, and one of their leaders, Alexander Mackenzie, had opened a line of communication, albeit a difficult one, to the Western Ocean.⁴

The American nation had, through its citizens, participated in the deep-sea fur-trade, at first timidly, then boldly, and at last, for a brief space, in an almost monopolistic fashion. One of their earliest traders had the good fortune to discover the entrance to the Columbia River, the dominant geographic feature of the Oregon country. And before the generation which acquired independence had passed from the stage, the American interest in the region west of the Rocky Mountains and in the commerce of the Pacific seemed to justify the national exploring expedition under Lewis and Clark to trace the course of the Columbia to the sea, and establish the line of connection between its head waters and those of the Missouri. A gigantic trading concern, headed by John Jacob Astor, an American citizen, following in the footsteps of the American explorers, fixed its entrepôt at the mouth of the Columbia in the hope of monopolizing the fur-trade of the entire region watered by that river system and of the adjacent coasts both north and south. This company had encountered an active, though not an entrenched, British opposition from traders of the North-West Company located on the upper waters of the Columbia. The accident of war, disturbing the natural course of commercial development on the Pacific, substituted the British for the American company as the controlling influence in that region.⁵

The facts just stated, typical though not exhaustive,⁶ exhibit a situation boding strife. For it was not to be expected that Great Britain, always under the goad of commercial ambition, would at our mere suggestion relinquish her interests in that quarter, especially since the war had resulted in placing her people temporarily in

⁴ Mackenzie's *Voyage*, including the account of his exploration of Mackenzie River in 1789 and his journey to the Pacific in 1792-1793, was published at London in 1801.

⁵ The classic account of the Astoria enterprise and the transfer of Astor's posts to the North-West Company is Irving's *Astoria*, which is based upon materials furnished by Mr. Astor. A condensed account may be conveniently read in the author's *History of the Pacific Northwest*, chapters VII. and VIII. The note at the end of chapter VIII. mentions most of the sources now accessible.

⁶ No mention has been made, for example, of the Nootka Convention of 1790, between Great Britain and Spain, by which Great Britain gained an acknowledged right to "trade and make settlements in" any part of the country north of California. For a full account of the Nootka Controversy see W. R. Manning in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1904, pp. 281-477.

control of the rich Columbia River fur-trade. As to the Americans, every circumstance touching their recent participation in far western affairs—the Lewis and Clark expedition, the Astor enterprise, the involuntary retirement from the Columbia under the pressure of war—negatived the idea of acquiescence in a permanent British occupation. Momentary, accidental eclipse could hardly blur the fact, deducible from considerations of our national expansion westward, that the American interest in Oregon was in reality waxing, not waning.

It should have required no exceptional insight to predict in 1815 that the solution of the problem presented in the conflicting claims of the two nations must be found in compromise, in the division between them of the territory to which, in its entirety, each asserted rights; and, despite the voluminous arguments to prove a superior title to the whole, each of the claimants practically recognized from the outset the inherent necessity of an accommodating mode of adjustment and each was prepared to concede a definite basis of settlement on that principle. The problem, from the opening of the discussion to its close, was to bring into agreement two divergent proposals of compromise. During three decades, the United States stood ready to accept the forty-ninth parallel as the frontier, while Great Britain insisted on the Columbia River from its intersection with the forty-ninth parallel to the sea.

These pretensions, on the one hand as on the other, were the expressions of national interests regarded as permanent, and they are found to be rooted in conditions antedating the emergence of the Oregon question proper. For Britain two distinct lines of commercial endeavor met in the Oregon country—the coastal trade, supporting her general commerce in Pacific waters and especially with China, and the continental fur-trade. The first had declined during the European wars but it was susceptible of indefinite development, especially if the continental trade could be linked with it after the manner in which the Astor Company had temporarily united them. By the Nootka Convention of 1790 with Spain,⁷ Great Britain secured for her subjects a right to trade and form settlements anywhere to the north of the Spanish settlements in California. They could, if once established on the coast, gather furs at all the ports and inlets as far north as Alaska. But the profitable use of this right depended upon the control of the continental trade which would supply the bulk of the shipping, and for this the Columbia River was indispensable. Mackenzie, who was the prophet as well as the

⁷ See Manning, "Nootka Sound Controversy", p. 455.

pioneer of British trade extension over the northern half of the continent, saw clearly the significance to Britain of a hold on the Columbia. Writing in 1801 about his scheme to consolidate the Hudson's Bay and North-West Companies in order to monopolize the fur-trade "from the parallel of 45 to the Pole", using preferably the Nelson River and the Saskatchewan as the line of communication from the sea to the Rockies, he says:

But whatever course may be taken from the Atlantic, the Columbia is the line of communication from the Pacific Ocean, pointed out by nature, as it is the only navigable river in the whole extent of Vancouver's minute survey of that coast; its banks also form the first level country in all the Southern extent of continental coast from Cook's entry, and, consequently, the most Northern situation fit for colonization, and suitable to the residence of a civilized people.⁸

The line of posts would begin at the mouth of the Columbia, ascend that river to the Rockies, connect with the upper waters of the Saskatchewan, and by that river, the Manitoba lakes, and Nelson River to the sea. Connected with this trade would be the "fishing in both seas, and the markets of the four quarters of the globe".⁹

Mackenzie's project, perhaps the prototype of Astor's, at least the earlier by some half dozen years, was in process of partial execution during the years 1801 to 1813, and it was therefore not an accident that the North-West Company was at hand on the Columbia when the war broke out, to slip into the position which, in view of the British control of the sea, became to the Americans untenable.¹⁰ At least, the brothers M'Gillivray, leading partners of the North-West Company, declared in 1815 that the North-West Company,

⁸ *Voyages*, p. 411. Though Mackenzie was mistaken about the identity of the Tacoutchee Tesse—the stream he had followed southward for some distance west of the Rockies—and the Columbia, an identity assumed in his book, this fact did not alter the argument contained in the words quoted; for it was the Columbia and not the Tacoutchee Tesse which in its upper course approached the headwaters of the Saskatchewan, by which Mackenzie proposed to reach the Rocky Mountains.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 411.

¹⁰ David Thompson, in a memorial written in 1845, claimed that the North-West Company selected him to establish trading posts west of the Rockies in 1801; that he crossed the mountains to M'Gillivray's River—head of the Columbia—but was driven back by Indians. His memorial is in the Public Record Office, London, F. O. Am. 440. Be this as it may, we know from Thompson's journals that he was on the upper Columbia in 1807, and that from that date he spent much time west of the mountains surveying and establishing trading posts for his company. Astor's party had barely established itself at Astoria in 1811 when Thompson arrived at the mouth of the river, evidently with a view to taking possession for his company. See on Thompson's movements during the years 1807-1811, Coues, *Journals of Henry and Thompson*, index. Also Terrell, *David Thompson*.

having extended its trade across the Rockies, was making all necessary preparations for supporting it by sending ships to the Columbia at the time when the war of 1812 broke out. Their statement is *ex parte* but on this point there is no good reason to discredit it.¹¹ With the Columbia in British hands, or the free use of it throughout its course guaranteed to them, the dream of Mackenzie might be realized; its loss would have involved the immediate sacrifice of an immense trade area and the certainty that some rival American company would entrench itself at the mouth of that river to carry on a destructive competition both along the coast and through the interior.¹²

Besides their interest in regaining control of the Columbia, lost through the fortune of war, and restoring to Americans the fur-trade of that region, which Astor estimated to be worth prospectively "some millions of dollars per annum",¹³ the United States found in general policy a motive for insisting upon the forty-ninth parallel as the boundary, to the sea. The origin of this demand connects itself with the history of the first northwestern boundary as described in the treaty of Paris of 1783, as well as with the second northwestern boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains incident to the American purchase of Louisiana. For when it became apparent that a line *due west* from the Lake of the Woods to the Mississippi, as described in the treaty of 1783, was geographically impossible—since the source of the Mississippi lay to the south of the lake—the British government began to insist strongly on such a rectification of the boundary as would bring their territory in contact with the river at a point far below its source, contending that only in this way could their treaty right to navigate the river become effective.¹⁴

¹¹ They say the company had "applied to government for a charter or grant of the trade of the country to be thus supplied [by sea—the Oregon region], and to the East India Company for permission to carry its products to China, and thus two years were occupied in these applications and preparatory arrangements. This was the state of the matter at the commencement of the last war with the United States, when at length government resolved to interfere in the matter." "Statement relative to the Columbia River and the Adjoining Territory on the North West Coast of North America." Enclosed in S. M'Gillivray's letter to Bagot of November 15, 1817. Found with Bagot's despatch, no. 74, Public Record Office, F. O. Am. 123.

¹² Mr. Astor himself hoped to return to the Columbia in case that region should be restored to the United States at the close of the war. See his letter to Jefferson, October 18, 1813. MS. Jefferson Papers, Washington. Also Gallatin's letter of August 5, 1834, to Astor. Gallatin's *Writings*, Adams ed., II. 505.

¹³ Letter to Jefferson, October, 1813.

¹⁴ In the negotiation of 1794, resulting in the Jay Treaty, Lord Grenville proposed as the boundary in the northwest a line from West Bay of Lake Superior

Had they succeeded in this object, Great Britain would have been placed at an advantage with reference to all of the undistributed territory lying west of the upper Mississippi on the practical ground that this territory was contiguous to her own. Mackenzie, who well understood the force of the argument from contiguity, declared in 1801 that wherever the rectified northwestern boundary line should strike the Mississippi—and he apparently thought the point would be at the parallel of 45° —"it must be continued West, till it terminates in the Pacific Ocean, to the South of the Columbia."¹⁵ In other words, he regarded the coveted position on the Mississippi as a political fulcrum, on which, by the dextrous use of the commercial lever, every portion of the territory north of a right line extending to the Pacific might be quietly lifted into the British sphere of control.

How far Mackenzie may have reflected his government's policy of the moment cannot be fully determined; but there is no doubt that the American government was on guard against contingencies such as he suggested, and that they sought by both positive and negative means to render this naïve forecast of British expansion southward an unsubstantial dream. For when, in the first months of the year 1803, the threatened occupation of New Orleans by the French seemed to justify an alliance with Britain as a means of freeing the lower Mississippi, the government, though authorizing a treaty for that purpose, instructed their commissioners, Monroe and Livingston, not to admit as a condition of such alliance Great Britain's anticipated demand of the privilege of acquiring territory west of the upper Mississippi. Three things, Secretary of State Madison thought, suggested the probability that she would claim such a privilege: her anxiety "to extend her domain to the Mississippi, the uncertain extent of her claims, from North to South, beyond the Western limits of the United States, and the attention she has paid to the North West coast of America".¹⁶ Gallatin, at about the same time, thought we might be obliged to take immediate possession of northern Louisiana "to prevent G[reat] B[ritain] from doing the same".¹⁷

drawn due west toward Red Lake River of the Mississippi, to intercept at right angles a line drawn due north from the angle formed by the junction of the St. Croix with the Mississippi. See maps, *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I. 492. Also pp. 488, 490-492.

¹⁵ *Voyages*, p. 399.

¹⁶ Letter to Monroe and Livingston, April 18, 1803. *Writings of James Madison*, ed. Hunt, VII. 39.

¹⁷ Letter to Jefferson, April 13, 1803, commenting on some proposed instructions for Captain Lewis. Gallatin thought Lewis should examine carefully into

By a stroke of fortune, over which Americans have not yet ceased to wonder, the Louisiana territory of vast but indefinite extent fell into our hands at this very time. It instantly introduced a new problem—the determination of a boundary between Great Britain and the United States west of the Lake of the Woods—and this, since the United States set up a claim to the forty-ninth parallel for that boundary, practically administered the coup de grâce to Britain's claim to come down on the Mississippi.¹⁸ The idea was not at once abandoned, and at the opening of the negotiations following the war of 1812 the British government showed a disposition to force the United States into compliance with their most extreme pretensions in that quarter, but without avail.¹⁹

Meantime, the United States was beginning to employ the argument from contiguity in a manner quite as sweeping as that exhibited by Mackenzie in 1801, but with a very different motive and a different effect. Mackenzie had desired Britain's boundary to come down on the Mississippi *in order* that it might be carried to the Pacific south of the Columbia, thus placing that river at the service of British traders. When Monroe, in 1814, insisted on the restoration of Astoria to the United States he apparently feared that its possession by Britain would facilitate her encroachment upon territory claimed by the United States south of 49° *east of the Rockies*.

the means by which a British attempt upon the Missouri could be frustrated. He conceived that "the future destinies of the Missouri country are of vast importance to the United States." The above are among a number of hints tending to require the ascription of a political or precautionary motive for the Lewis and Clark expedition in addition to the scientific and commercial motives usually regarded as sufficient. Supplementary hints are found in Jefferson's secret message of January 18, 1803, and in Lewis's first letter to Jefferson on his return to St. Louis, September 23, 1806. *Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, ed. Thwaites, VII. 334.

¹⁸ On May 12, 1803, just twelve days after the signing of the Louisiana Treaty, Rufus King and Lord Hawkesbury agreed on a treaty by which Great Britain would have been granted "the shortest line which can be drawn between the northwest point of the Lake of the Woods and the nearest source of the Mississippi". But this provision was rejected by the United States Senate on the ground that it might in the future "be pretended to operate as a limitation to the claims of territory acquired by the United States" from France. John Quincy Adams to the Secretary of State, December 16, 1803. *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, II. 590. See also Senate resolution of February 5, 1804, *ibid.*, p. 591. Also, Madison to Monroe, February 14, 1804, explaining how the fifth article of this treaty might have affected the Louisiana boundary, which was believed to have been fixed at the forty-ninth parallel by commissioners appointed in consequence of the treaty of Utrecht. *Ibid.*, III. 80 ff.

¹⁹ The British commissioners at first demanded a line from the western end of Lake Superior to the Mississippi, and when the Americans protested this as aggressive they suggested the line from the Lake of the Woods southward to the head of the river. *Ibid.*, pp. 309, 310, 312.

He therefore contended that "on no pretext can the British Government set up a claim to territory south of the northern boundary of the United States."²⁰

That boundary, fixed by the treaty of 1783 at the northwest point of the Lake of the Woods, coincided unusually well with the claim, based upon unverified tradition, that the treaty of Utrecht contemplated a settlement of limits between France and England at the forty-ninth parallel of latitude. Under these circumstances the forty-ninth parallel could be insisted upon as a "convenient boundary"²¹ through the entire stretch of wilderness in which the territories of the two nations were contiguous—ultimately from the Lake of the Woods to the Pacific. Eventually, this line was fixed in two sections, first from the Lake of the Woods to the Rockies and, second, from the Rockies to the sea, with an interval of twenty-eight years between their respective settlements. The extension of the line from the Lake of the Woods westward was first discussed, unsuccessfully, in 1806–1807,²² and again in 1814.²³ After the latter date and prior to October, 1818, when the question was set at rest by treaty, occurred the first phase of the Oregon discussion proper, a phase which it is difficult, or rather impossible, to disentangle from the question of the boundary extending from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains.

We saw above that Monroe in March, 1814, before it was known

²⁰ The entire letter, dated March 22, 1814, and addressed to the commissioners of the United States to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain, is as follows: "Should a treaty be concluded with Great Britain, and a reciprocal restitution of territory be agreed on, you will have it in recollection that the United States had in their possession, at the commencement of the war, a post at the mouth of the river Columbia, which commanded the river, which ought to be comprised in the stipulation, should the possession have been wrested from us during the war. On no pretext can the British Government set up a claim to territory south of the northern boundary of the United States. It is not believed that they have any claim whatever to territory on the Pacific ocean. You will, however, be careful, should a definition of boundary be attempted, not to countenance, in any manner, or in any quarter, a pretension in the British Government to territory south of that line." *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, III. 731.

²¹ Gallatin so spoke of it in a letter of December 25, 1814. *Writings*, I. 646.

²² On the feeling in England at that time respecting the prospect of developing a British claim in the region of the Missouri by occupancy, conquest, or purchase from Spain, see report of American commissioners, Monroe and W. Pinckney. *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, III. 162.

²³ In 1814 the British commissioners would have been willing to define the boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Rockies in a manner satisfactory to the United States, but only on condition that the old British claim of a right to approach the Mississippi should be admitted by the United States. This proposal was rejected. See *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, III. 732–733, and 738. Also, J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs*, III., especially pp. 84–86, 110–111; and Gallatin, *Writings*, I. 646.

at Washington that Astoria had been captured, instructed the American peace commissioners to procure its restitution in case it should have been taken. In the treaty negotiated at Ghent nothing was said about Astoria specifically, but the first article stipulates that "all territory, places, and possessions whatsoever taken by either party from the other during the war, or which may be taken after the signing of this treaty, excepting only the islands hereinafter mentioned [in Passamaquoddy Bay, see Art. IV.], shall be restored without delay . . ." ²⁴

One day in the month of July following, Mr. Monroe requested an interview with Mr. Anthony St. John Baker, the British chargé d'affaires at Washington, and on his responding, called attention to the post which at the outbreak of hostilities the United States had maintained on the Columbia but which had been broken up by a British naval force. In his opinion, this case was covered by the language of Article I., otherwise it would have been made an exception as were the islands in Passamaquoddy Bay. Baker was evidently taken by surprise, and appears to have been without definite information on the subject. ²⁵ So he parried for the moment and Monroe shortly afterward put in writing a formal demand for orders from the British government to the British commander on the Columbia to turn over the establishment to an authorized agent of the United States, declaring that measures would be taken without delay for its reoccupation. ²⁶ Baker's reply was still vague. He had received no instructions on the subject of such orders, and thought that although the post had probably been captured, yet it was very uncertain whether any person was left there who would be competent to make the transfer. He referred Monroe to Admiral Dixon for definite information on the points in question.

There is nothing to show that the British government ever furnished Baker with instructions on the subject, nor anything to explain the American government's delay in carrying out the an-

²⁴ *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, III. 746.

²⁵ Baker's letter of July 19, 1815, to his government. MS. in Public Record Office, London, F. O. Am. 107.

²⁶ Enclosed with Baker's letter of July 19, 1815; also in *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, IV. 852. Monroe's letter was dated July 18, 1815. His information doubtless came from Astor. It is probable, too, that the United States government was relying on Astor to reoccupy the post, for he seemed disposed at this time to re-establish his western trade. See Astor's letter to Hunt, in Irving, *Astoria* (revised edition, 1849), p. 495. Also Gallatin's letter to Astor, August 4, 1834, *Writings*, II. 503-505. Gallatin testified that Astor had stated to him, he thought in 1816, that he would reoccupy the Columbia if the American government would afford him some military support.

nounced intention to reoccupy Astoria.²⁷ The whole matter remained in abeyance for more than two years, or until November, 1817. On the 24th of that month Mr. Charles Bagot, the British minister who had superseded Baker at Washington, extracted from John Quincy Adams, the new Secretary of State, a confession that the sloop of war *Ontario*, Captain Biddle, "had been ordered to proceed to the mouth of the Columbia River, for the purpose of re-establishing the settlement of which the United States had been dispossessed during the war".²⁸ Bagot had been hearing rumors that the *Ontario* was sailing upon such a mission,²⁹ but these were so vague as to furnish no sufficient ground for bringing the matter to Mr. Adams. On November 21, however, he received a letter from Simon M'Gillivray, one of the principal partners of the North-West Company, in which that gentleman professed to have secured in New York, from a thoroughly reliable source, information to show that the *Ontario* was destined for the Pacific and that Captain Biddle had orders "to seize or destroy the establishments and trade of the North-West Company upon that coast".³⁰ Bagot now felt constrained to question the Secretary of State on the subject and, though Adams seemed to him a good deal embarrassed, he admitted the orders to re-establish the "settlement" and denied that Biddle had received orders to destroy or disturb the North-West Company's trade. Adams's theory was that the place had for many years belonged to the United States; that it had been captured by a British fleet; that it should have been restored after the war; and that now, since according to Mr. Baker it was doubtful if anyone could be found there to make the restitution, the only thing left to do was for the American government to re-establish it. In the conversation which ensued, Adams asserted that the Columbia River had first been discovered by an American ship, while Bagot retorted that the coast of the Pacific had been uniformly claimed by Great Britain in her discussions with Spain—her only legitimate contestant in that region—and that both

²⁷ The place was named Fort George on the occasion of its capture in December, 1813. Astor's fur business in the Lake region and elsewhere had been seriously deranged by the war, and time was required to bring it back into good condition; so that if, as seems likely, the re-establishment depended on him the delay may have been caused by the untoward posture of Astor's affairs at this time.

²⁸ Bagot's cipher despatch of November 24, 1817. MS. in Public Record Office, London, F. O. Am. 123; decipher.

²⁹ See his despatch no. 65, of November 7, 1817. F. O. Am. 123.

³⁰ See Bagot's no. 74, of December 2, 1817, and the letter of Simon M'Gillivray enclosed. This letter was dated New York, November 15, 1817.

Vancouver and Mackenzie had taken formal possession for their government. No general argument took place.³¹

Bagot wrote at once to his government. He also wrote to Governor-General Sherbrooke of Canada, suggesting that the news of the *Ontario's* departure be transmitted overland to the mouth of the Columbia, in order to make sure that on her arrival there the territory might be found to be actually in the possession of British subjects; he was in doubt whether he ought also to apprise the British admiral at Halifax of this state of things and suggest the expediency of dispatching a ship to the Columbia in the hope of anticipating the *Ontario*.³²

It appears from these circumstances that the incident produced upon the British minister an alarming impression. And it must be confessed that the sailing of the *Ontario* with such an object and with such avowed orders, without notice to the British government, was, to say the least, disquieting. Adams and Monroe both assured Bagot that the failure to notify him of the government's intention to re-establish the post on the Columbia was a mere oversight, but in diplomacy such explanations are usually received with grains of allowance.³³ Yet, when Bagot's despatch number 74 reached Lord Castlereagh at the British Foreign Office, its representations produced an effect quite at variance with what the writer had anticipated. For Castlereagh, so far from showing trepidation, looked upon the affair of the *Ontario* as affording a happy opportunity to develop a policy of his own respecting the territorial relations of the United States and Great Britain west of the Mississippi.

This policy stands disclosed in two despatches³⁴ to Bagot of date February 4, 1818, the one intended for the eyes of Mr. Adams, the other as the minister's "chart and compass" in navigating the always difficult waters of a new negotiation. Briefly described, it was a "baiting" policy: Castlereagh began by conceding the right of the United States, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent, to be restored to "the same state of possession [on the Columbia] which they held at the breaking out of the war", and he issued

³¹ See Bagot's no. 74, of December 2, 1817. See also J. Q. Adams, *Memoirs*, IV. 24-25. Adams's account of the interview differs from Bagot's in minor matters of fact, and of course in tone.

³² Bagot's no. 74.

³³ Bagot declined to let the matter rest on the basis of the interview of November 24, but insisted on making it the subject of a formal note. In this note he enlarges on the British claims, using the facts and arguments furnished to him by M'Gillivray in a paper originally prepared by the North-West partners in 1815 and sent to Mr. Baker. See Bagot's no. 74.

³⁴ Despatches to Mr. Bagot, January to December, 1818, no. 2 and "separate and confidential". February 4, 1818. F. O. Am. 129.

orders accordingly for the restitution of Astoria to properly accredited officers of the American government. But here concession ended, and not only so, but the conditions of the restoration of Astoria were framed with an evident purpose to secure what it was hoped would prove a more valuable return concession from the United States. The American government had a good right to reoccupy Astoria, *but* the British government denied the validity of the American claim to the soil on which Astoria stood, and asserted the claim of Great Britain to that territory "upon which the American settlement must be considered as an encroachment". Having thus brought the question of right sharply into view, Castlereagh proposed to settle it by arbitration, a method provided in the treaty of Ghent itself for determining disputed points of possession and one which he believed the American government could not decline because on one question growing out of the execution of the treaty they had themselves proposed such a method of settlement.³⁵ Nor was he concerned with the Columbia River question solely, but he hoped to prevail upon the American government to agree to settle, by the same method, the whole extent of the boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Pacific, or rather, as Castlereagh stated it, with diplomatic caution, "to the utmost extent of the contiguous territories of the two states".

In his private despatch to Bagot it was pointed out that the boundary settlement should be divided into two parts: first, "that which concerns the line between the two states from the Lake of the Woods westward to the Mississippi—this far the two states must be contiguous"; secondly, "that which concerns the rights of the respective states to the westward of that river, where they may or may not be contiguous states". He instructed Bagot to propose that the disputed point on the Columbia should be determined first, because it was the more pressing and because the inquiry into that question would doubtless throw much light on the rights of the two states in the interior from the Mississippi westward.³⁶ It was ob-

³⁵ The question of the slaves carried away by the British after the war; were the slaves "possessions" under the meaning of the first article, which recites "all *territory, places, and possessions*" shall be restored, etc.? It involves a preliminary report by two commissioners, one appointed by each of the two governments; if these agreed the question was to be regarded as settled, if not, it was to go to an arbitrator.

³⁶ "It being obvious", says Castlereagh, "that altho' the rights of the respective parties in the interior and on the coast may have taken their origin in circumstances wholly unconnected, that where a line is to be drawn through a territory so wild and uncultivated as that westward of the Mississippi, towards the Pacific, it is for the convenience of both governments first to enquire what their respective rights are upon the sea-coast to which such frontier line is to be drawn, before they proceed to trace the intermediate boundary."

viously Castlereagh's hope that, the policy of arbitration once adopted, Great Britain might be able to establish her claims at the two ends of the line, the Mississippi and the Columbia, or at least one of them, after which the determination of the remainder of the boundary would be more likely to proceed in harmony with her interests. Since it was tacitly understood that the Emperor of Russia, with whom Castlereagh was a special favorite, would be asked to arbitrate any questions arising under the treaty of Ghent, there is every reason to believe that his plan would have operated largely to Britain's advantage. But in fact these proposals were not seriously considered by the American government. They accepted the freely offered concession that Astoria should be restored, but declined all the suggestions for arbitration.³⁷

The American government preferred to settle its boundary questions by the process of direct negotiation, and the principal result of the correspondence over the *Ontario* incident was to bring the whole subject of undetermined boundaries prominently before the British and American negotiators at London in the autumn of 1818. On that occasion Gallatin and Rush, for the United States, were instructed to accept as the boundary of Louisiana a line drawn along the forty-ninth parallel from the point where a line drawn due north or south (as the case might be) from the northwest point of the Lake of the Woods should intersect that parallel.³⁸ While no definite instruction was given with reference to a possible boundary west of the Rockies, the implication is that the American government was in no haste to settle it, particularly since Great Britain

³⁷ Astoria was formally turned over to J. B. Prevost, October 6, 1818. The reasons for declining arbitration on the boundary question while invoking that mode of settlement on the slave question, etc., are summed up by Adams in *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, IV. 372, 376, 377, 378.

³⁸ Adams to Gallatin and Rush, July 28, 1818. *Ibid.*, p. 377, 378. Adams says: "From the earnestness with which the British Government now return to the object of fixing this boundary, there is reason to believe that they have some other purpose connected with it, which they do not now avow, but which, in their estimation, gives it an importance not belonging to it, considered in itself. An attempt was at first made by them, at the negotiation of Ghent, to draw the boundary line from Lake Superior to the Mississippi. But, as they afterwards not only abandoned that pretension, but gave up even the pretension to an article renewing their right to the navigation of the Mississippi, it was to have been expected they would thenceforth have considered this western boundary of no importance to them. The new pretension, however, of disputing our title to the settlement at the mouth of Columbia river, either indicates a design on their part to encroach, by new establishments of their own, upon the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, south of which they can have no valid claim upon this continent; or it manifests a jealousy of the United States—a desire to check the progress of our settlements . . ."

had already specifically admitted the right of the United States respecting Astoria.

In the negotiations, concluded October 20, 1818, the British plenipotentiaries attempted once more to connect with the boundary question a clause granting them access to the Mississippi and securing the right of navigating that river. They ultimately gave up both of these points and accepted the American proposal to carry the line to the crest of the Rockies by the forty-ninth parallel. But they insisted throughout in connecting the boundary extending from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains with the question as to the country west of the Rockies, and practically refused to agree to any boundary settlement unless some arrangement were made respecting that territory. "This", say the American plenipotentiaries,

induced us to propose an extension of the boundary line due west to the Pacific Ocean. We did not assert that the United States had a perfect title to that country, but insisted that their claim was at least good as against Great Britain. The forty-ninth degree of north latitude had, in pursuance of the treaty of Utrecht, been fixed indefinitely, as the line between the northern British possessions and those of France, including Louisiana, now a part of our territories. There was no reason why, if the two countries extended their claims westward, the same line should not be continued to the Pacific Ocean. . . . They [the British plenipotentiaries] did not make any formal proposition for a boundary, but intimated that the river itself was the most convenient that could be adopted, and that they would not agree to any that did not give them the harbor at the mouth of the river in common with the United States.

The Americans declined to consider this but were willing to adopt a treaty which should be silent respecting the western territory. This the British declined, but proposed an article guaranteeing to both nations equal commercial rights in so much of the territory as is comprised between the parallels of forty-five and forty-nine degrees. The Americans declared they would rather leave the entire boundary question unsettled than to accept an agreement so derogatory to the United States, and they offered the "joint-occupation" article which was finally incorporated in the treaty.³⁹ The British plenipotentiaries concluded "that by thus leaving the country in question open to the trade of both nations [they] substantially

³⁹ Gallatin and Rush to the Secretary of State, October 18, 1818. *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, IV. 381. "It was at last agreed, but, as we thought, with some reluctance on the part of the British plenipotentiaries, that the country on the north-west coast, claimed by either party, should, without prejudice to the claims of either party [or the claims of any third power] and for a limited time [ten years] be opened, for the purpose of trade [and settlement], to the inhabitants of both countries."

secured to Great Britain every present advantage which could have flowed from its actual possession".⁴⁰

The significance to the Oregon question of the treaty of 1818 is twofold: it validated the contention of the United States for a boundary along the forty-ninth parallel to the Rockies as the northern limit of Louisiana, thus excluding from later discussions about Oregon all complicating questions affecting the country east of the mountains; and it postponed the final compromise. In both particulars the immediate advantage of the treaty lay with Britain. For, her subjects being already in monopolistic control of the fur-trade in Oregon, it was commercially important to leave that control undisturbed as long as possible. Since their possession of Oregon could thereafter not affect the country east of Oregon, toward the Mississippi, the American government was deprived of the most urgent reason for wishing to dislodge the British from the Columbia. On the other hand, the general result of the treaty was favorable to the United States. The principle of contiguity had gained enormously in momentum by the creation of the forty-ninth parallel boundary, while time, the most dependable ally of a rapidly expanding nation, would furnish opportunities for strengthening the American claim before the expiration of the joint-occupation agreement.

One advantage the American government hastened to secure, the transfer to the United States of all the rights of Spain on the Pacific Coast north of the parallel of forty-two degrees and extending presumably to the Alaska boundary.⁴¹ It was John Quincy Adams,⁴² the American statesman so little loved by George Canning, who is responsible for this new obstacle to the realization of Britain's hopes during the vigorous Canning régime which was about to ensue.

Thus far the treatment of the Oregon question by the British Foreign Office seems strongly tinctured with a spirit of opportunism.

⁴⁰ Robinson and Goulburn to Castlereagh. Board of Trade, October 20, 1818, F. O. Am. 138.

⁴¹ Adams to Gallatin and Rush, July 28, 1818. *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, IV. 377. He says: "From the late correspondence with the Spanish minister, Onís, it appears that the claim of Spain upon the shores of the South Sea extends to the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude".

⁴² "The acknowledgment of a definite line of boundary to the South Sea forms a great epocha in our history. The first proposal of it in this negotiation was my own, and I trust it is now secured beyond the reach of revocation. It was not even among our claims by the Treaty of Independence with Great Britain. It was not among our pretensions under the purchase of Louisiana—for that gave us only the range of the Mississippi and its waters. I first introduced it in the written proposal of 31st of October last, after having discussed it verbally both with Onís [Spanish minister] and De Neuville [French minister]. It is the only peculiar and appropriate right acquired by this treaty" Adams's *Memoirs*, IV. 275.

Castlereagh's effort of 1818, whatever may be thought of it on general grounds, was a policy for the moment only. The outlining of a definite, permanent Oregon policy was left for George Canning. Canning's attention was drawn to the Oregon question in connection with other matters during the years 1823-1824. Once more it was our own government that initiated the discussion,⁴³ stimulated now by persistent activity in Congress looking toward the erection of a territory of the United States on the Pacific.⁴⁴ In his letter instructing Mr. Rush to bring forward the Oregon matter,⁴⁵ Mr. Adams pointed out the rapidly developing interest of the United States in the settlement of the boundary, employing arguments drawn from the recent Congressional discussion of the question.⁴⁶ He also stated the basis of our government's claim "to the Columbia River, and to the interior territory washed by its waters", as resting upon its discovery from the sea and nomination by a citizen of the United States; upon its exploration to the sea by Captains Lewis and Clarke; upon the settlement of Astoria, made under the protection of the United States, and thus restored to them in 1818; and upon the subsequent acquisition of all the rights of Spain, the only European power who, prior to the discovery of the river, had any pretensions to territorial rights on the Northwest Coast of America.

He believed the river to rise as far north as the fifty-first parallel and was prepared to offer that line as a boundary to the sea. But he was willing, nevertheless, to drop down to the parallel of forty-nine, should Britain strongly insist upon it, because that parallel had already been selected for the boundary as far west as the Rocky Mountains. When Canning learned what the American proposals were, he wrote the despatch (May 31, 1824)⁴⁷ to the British

⁴³ The British government had studiously avoided the question since 1818. When, in January, 1821, their minister at Washington, Stratford Canning, unwittingly got into an altercation with Adams on the subject, and wrote home for instructions, Castlereagh required him to say nothing further on the Oregon question without specific instructions received in advance. See Castlereagh to S. Canning, April 10, 1821, F. O. Am. 156. On the altercation itself, one of the most spirited in the history of our State Department, see Canning to Castlereagh, January 28, 1821, and his cipher despatch of January 30, 1821, in F. O. Am. 157. Also, Adams's *Memoirs*, V. 243-259.

⁴⁴ This discussion was started by John Floyd, member of the House from Virginia. He was a cousin of Charles Floyd of the Lewis and Clark Expedition and was in close touch with Ramsay Crooks and other "Astorians" as well as with those representing the whaling interests of eastern Massachusetts. For an account of Floyd see Bourne, "Aspects of Oregon History before 1840", in *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, VI. 255. See also, for the Congressional debate on Oregon, Schafer, *Pacific Northwest*, ch. ix.

⁴⁵ Letter of July 22, 1823. *Am. St. Pap., F. R.*, V. 721.

⁴⁶ They will be found summed up in Floyd's *Report* to the House of Representatives, January 25, 1821, reprinted in the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, VIII. 51-75.

⁴⁷ MS. in F. O. Am. 191.

plenipotentiaries which, better than any other document, sums up the principles governing Great Britain's attitude during the twenty years which followed.

He appears conscious that the question is not, from Britain's viewpoint, a pressing one, since the joint-occupation agreement has still four years to run and the rights of Russia are in course of adjustment.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, his government was prepared to treat with the United States for a delimitation of frontiers west of the Rocky Mountains "on the joint principles of occupancy and reciprocal convenience". Great Britain was ready to make a reasonable concession, but could not accede to the American demand that she exclude herself from the entire stretch of coast from 42° to 51°. "Within that space", he says,

is Nootka; and we may well be allowed to ask, under what pretense the United States Government can expect that Great Britain should, in their favor, surrender her claim to a part of the coast from which, when Spain attempted to exclude her in 1790, she maintained her right in opposition to that power at every risk and maintained it successfully. Within the same space is situated the mouth of the Oregon or Columbia River, the only great navigable communication, hitherto ascertained to exist, with the interior of that part of the country. The entrance to this river was surveyed by British officers at the expense of the British nation many years before any agent of the American Government had visited its shores, and the trading posts of the Hudson's Bay Company are now and have for some time been stationed on its waters.

What, in opposition to this state of facts, can the United States adduce to sustain their claim? That claim, whatever it may be, must have originated in one of three ways: either in the purchase of Louisiana from France, in the treaty of 1819 with Spain, or in acts of the American government performed independently of other nations. That government has the right to select, for purposes of argument, either the French title, the Spanish title, or the American title, as the one or the other may seem the least vulnerable. But the "French title, if good, must be good exclusively as French; the Spanish, as Spanish; and the American, as American . . . it never can be tolerated that either the French, or the Spanish, or the American title should be exhibited at the same time under a threefold aspect, or that the defect of any one of these titles should be supplied by arguments deduced from the other two", the titles being, as he believed, mutually contradictory.

⁴⁸ Russia stipulated with the United States in 1824 and with Great Britain in 1825 to restrain her settlements to the region north of 54° 40', provided the other party would in such case remain south of that line. This left the United States and Great Britain the sole contestants for territorial rights west of the Rockies from 42° to 54° 40'.

Canning traverses the grounds of claim under each of the three titles. He finds that Louisiana, from the purchase of which arose the French title, was merely coextensive with the drainage basin of the Mississippi system and could have carried with it no right to territory west of the Rockies. The Spanish title was based upon discovery solely, since Spain planted no settlements north of San Francisco, and on the ground of discovery Britain might urge the prior discoveries of Francis Drake, were it not that the Nootka Convention of October, 1790, between Spain and Great Britain set the whole question as between those two powers at rest. If the United States claim under the Spanish title, they must be prepared to take that title with all the limitations Spain had placed upon it, of which the Nootka Convention granting to Britain the right to trade and form settlements anywhere on the coast north of California was the chief.⁴⁹ The claim made by the United States in their own right he finds inferior to the British claim because, first, British navigators had explored at large expense considerable sections of the coast before the accidental discovery of the river by Gray; the river itself was explored by Broughton at least ten years before the arrival of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and though a party of Americans had formed an establishment at the mouth of the river in 1811, they soon sold it to the British company, whose successors had since then developed the trade of the entire Columbia region, occupying several stations south and east of the river below the forty-ninth parallel and connecting the Columbia trade with the Canadian fur-trade. It would be impossible to assign to each party precisely the territory which on the basis of prior discovery, exploration, and occupancy might be justly claimed, and the only reasonable procedure would be to divide the whole territory by the line of the Columbia River to the forty-ninth parallel, and then along that parallel to the Rocky Mountains. By such a compromise, which he authorized, Britain would secure "the only points of substantial interest to us, I mean the undisputed possession of the whole country on the right bank of the upper Columbia and a free issue for its produce by the channel of that river. In executing my present

⁴⁹ Zest was imparted to Canning's discussion of the Spanish title because he knew it was on the basis of that title the United States had announced its opposition to the further colonization of the American continent by European nations. This "Monroe Doctrine" was to be specifically protested, or at least interpreted so far as it affected Britain's status in North America, in the Oregon negotiation.

Everett wrote, no. 69, December 2, 1843, that Lord Aberdeen had a "very low opinion of the exclusive rights of Spain in the unsettled portions of the continent". This, as you are aware, is an hereditary element in British Colonial politics. Despatches to Dept. of State, American Embassy in London, vol. VIII.

instruction you will be careful to provide effectually for this object."

The negotiation of 1824 got no farther than the mutual exchange of proposals by the parties.⁵⁰ When, in 1826, Gallatin was sent to London to negotiate a treaty covering all questions in dispute between Britain and the United States, Canning repeated to the British plenipotentiaries the above instructions, ultimately adding to them a letter⁵¹ containing a further concession. Since there was no harbor on the Pacific coast between San Francisco and Puget Sound fit to receive a warship, the British government would be willing to make over to the United States Port Discovery on De Fuca's Strait, with a radius of five miles of territory about it; or, should this not satisfy Mr. Gallatin, they would even be willing to give up a triangle of land, with all the harbors pertaining thereto, bounded by the Pacific on the west, Fuca's Strait on the north, and Hood's Canal, with a line drawn from its southern extremity to a point ten miles south of Gray's harbor as the other boundary. But Great Britain would not abandon the Columbia River boundary as the basis of compromise in spite of Gallatin's offer to yield to her the navigation of the river, on certain conditions, provided the forty-ninth parallel were made the basis. Thus agreement was out of the question and the negotiation ended with a mere extension for an indefinite term, of the earlier joint-occupation principle.⁵²

A significant glimpse into the more secret recesses of Canning's mind, as respects the Oregon question, may be had through his letter to Lord Liverpool, dated July 7, 1826.⁵³ In that letter he deplors the "blunder" committed by the British government when they agreed to restore Astoria,⁵⁴ but he hopes to be able to retrieve it

if we maintain our present ground immovably. If we retreat from that, the cession of Astoria will have been but the first symptom of

⁵⁰ The American proposal was rejected, the British proposal was taken by Mr. Rush *ad referendum*, but nothing came of it.

⁵¹ See Canning to Huskisson and Addington, November 10, 1826, for his renewal of the instructions of 1824, and his letter of November 30, 1826, for the supplementary instruction. Both are in F. O. Am. 219.

⁵² The treaty stipulated that the joint-occupation agreement might be terminated by either party, a notice of one year to the other party being the only formality required.

⁵³ See E. J. Stapleton, *Some Official Correspondence of George Canning*, II. 71-75.

⁵⁴ "I do not hesitate to say that our decision on that occasion was absolutely unjustifiable. . . . Compare the Bill of Sale by which the settlement, or block-house, of Astoria was made over for a valuable consideration, by a company half British and half American, to a wholly British Company, with the first article of the Treaty of Ghent stipulating the restoration of places 'taken' in war; and read Lord B[athurst]'s despatch directing the surrender to the Yankees of the settlement so bought and sold"

weakness, the first of a series of compliances with encroachments which, if not resisted, will grow upon success. There are two points—one of a political, the other of a commercial character—which I anxiously desire you to bear in mind in the discussion of this question.

1st. That the ambitious and overbearing views of the States are becoming daily more developed, and better understood in this country.

2nd. That the trade between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, direct across the Pacific, is the trade of the world most susceptible of rapid augmentation and improvement. Between China and Mexico, it is now going on largely We cannot yet enter into this trade, on account of the monopoly of the E[ast] I[ndia] C[ompan]y. But ten years hence that monopoly will cease; and though at that period neither you nor I shall be where we are to answer for our deeds, I should not like to leave my name affixed to an instrument by which England would have foregone the advantages of an immense direct intercourse between China and what may be, if we resolve not to yield them up, her boundless establishments on the N. W. Coast of America.

Canning's life ended before the completion of the negotiations of 1826-1827. Perhaps this helps to explain why the Oregon policy he announced, embodying his anti-American sentiments, as exhibited on numerous other occasions⁵⁵ as well as on this,⁵⁶ coupled with his militant patriotism and the prophetic feeling respecting the China trade revealed in the above letter, became all but fatally binding upon his successors. Certain it is that his programme of "staking the midstream [of the Columbia] as our boundary" was the programme under which the Oregon negotiation was resumed by the British ministry after the lapse of sixteen years, and it would infallibly have brought on a war with the United States had not such a calamity been averted by the more temperate statesmanship of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen.

In 1842, Lord Ashburton was dispatched to Washington to negotiate with Secretary Webster all outstanding differences with the United States, principally the northeastern boundary, but subordinate thereto the question of the Oregon boundary. Aberdeen's instructions to Ashburton on that subject⁵⁷ proceed upon the assumption, already made by Canning, that "the actual title of both parties

⁵⁵ See Henry Adams, *History of the United States*, index, "Canning"; W. C. Ford, "John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine", in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VII. 676 ff. and VIII. 28 ff.

⁵⁶ See Gallatin's *Writings*, II. 338, 343-344. Canning professed to see in Baylies's *Report on the Oregon Question* (1826), so Gallatin wrote to Adams, evidence of a warlike spirit against Great Britain in the United States. Mr. Adams commented: (Gallatin, II. 367) "If Mr. Canning has not enough upon his hands to soothe the feelings of foreign nations for what he says in Parliament himself, he would think it passing strange to be called to account for offenses of that character committed by Mr. Brougham or Mr. Hume."

⁵⁷ F. O. Am. 378.

appears mainly to depend upon joint occupancy, use, and settlement." Since it was understood that the United States government would propose the abrogation of the joint-occupation agreement, Ashburton was authorized to accept, as a permanent boundary, the line on the forty-ninth parallel from the Rocky Mountains to the Columbia, and thence along the middle of that river to the sea.⁵⁸ "But", continues Lord Aberdeen, "your Lordship will reject the proposal formerly made by the American Government, in case it should be repeated, of following the forty-ninth parallel of latitude from the Rocky Mountains to the ocean, as the boundary of the territory of the two states."⁵⁹

Ashburton's experience in the ensuing negotiation was disappointing. He wrote on April 25, after a preliminary conference with Webster, that he expected to settle the Oregon boundary "satisfactorily, and by this I mean to carry our line down to the river". Webster, he reports, had complained that this would leave the United States no good harbor on the coast, but suggested that the matter might be adjusted provided his government could secure from Mexico the harbor of San Francisco. Ashburton expressed, unofficially, the belief that Great Britain would not oppose the plan of a cession from Mexico, and he trusted that this declaration—San Francisco being greatly desired by the United States—would pave the way for an immediate settlement of the Oregon boundary on his own terms.⁶⁰ But it would seem that Webster was not eager to purchase by so great a concession the mere neutrality of Great Britain respecting California.⁶¹ And after the return to Washington of the

⁵⁸ He was to begin, however, with a proposal for fixing the boundary along the midstream of the Columbia from its mouth to its junction with the Snake River, from which point a line was to be run due east to the crest of the Rockies, and thence along the ridge of those mountains to the forty-ninth parallel. This minimum offer was probably intended to offset the anticipated maximum demand of the United States.

⁵⁹ The instructions of Ashburton were printed in *House Ex. Doc.*, 42 Cong., 3 sess., no. 1, 1872-1873, vol. v, pt. 2 (*Berlin Arbitration*).

⁶⁰ "I said", writes Ashburton, "that we could take no part in any arrangement of this description, but that . . . I believed that we should make no objection to any arrangement of the kind provided the cession by Mexico were voluntary. Here this matter now stands. We shall probably get our boundary with the understanding I mention, but without waiting for our treaty the conclusion of their arrangements with Mexico with which we are to have no concern." He says Mr. Everett had spoken to him about the matter of San Francisco before he left England. "I doubt whether in any case we could interfere with effect to prevent this arrangement, unless it were attempted to be forced on Mexico. We shall therefore do well to avail ourselves of the circumstances of this expectation to settle satisfactorily our own boundaries."

⁶¹ His letter of January 29, 1843, to Everett (see *Writings*, National Edition, XVI. 393-396) suggesting a tripartite arrangement, Great Britain, Mexico, and

American exploring squadron under Lieutenant Charles Wilkes, with new and exact information respecting the Oregon country and its ports, Ashburton's hope of securing the river boundary vanished. The officers of the squadron had reported very unfavorably on the Columbia River port, where they lost the ship *Peacock* in 1841, but they represented the northern harbors, entered from the Strait of Juan de Fuca, as in every way desirable and in fact essential to the United States.⁶² So, although Webster and Ashburton reached a happy agreement respecting the northeastern boundary, their treaty is silent on the subject of Oregon.

In order to complete this sketch it is necessary to inquire how a British cabinet which began in 1842 with a peremptory refusal to accept the forty-ninth parallel as the boundary to the sea, brought itself to propose what was essentially this mode of settlement four years later. Though the story of the negotiations and attempts at negotiation during that period is long and intricate, the explanation of Britain's change of attitude seems to me, from the evidence now at hand, reasonably simple. It turns upon the honest desire of Sir Robert Peel's administration to avoid a rupture with the United States—a sentiment not always heartily reciprocated by our own government.⁶³ Edward Everett, who was our minister at London the United States being the parties, probably indicates his real views; at least, his views after the return of the Wilkes Exploring Expedition early in June, 1842. Mexico must cede Upper California to the United States. The United States was to pay [blank] millions of dollars, of which a portion was to go to American citizens having claims against Mexico, and another definite portion to British subjects having claims against Mexico. The Oregon boundary was "to be run pretty much as mentioned to you", probably in the letter of November 28, 1842 (*Private Correspondence*, Nat. Ed., II. 150 ff.). In that letter Webster spoke of a suggested boundary beginning at Fuca's Strait, running up the strait, apparently to the south end of Admiralty Inlet and thence south, striking the river below Vancouver and following it "to its intersection with the 49th degree of latitude North". Mr. Fox, British minister at Washington, wrote Lord Aberdeen February 24, 1843, that Webster had that day spoken to him about the "tripartite" plan. He says Webster hopes to secure San Francisco "through the good offices of His Majesty's Government". F. O. Am. 391.

⁶² See Wilkes's *Exploring Expedition* (Philadelphia, 1845), V. 171-172. Ashburton thinks it is the report of the squadron's officers to the government "which induces the government to hesitate about letting our boundary come down to the river". Ashburton to Aberdeen, June 29, 1842, F. O. Am. 379. Sir George Simpson, who met the Wilkes party in Oregon, learned that it was the intention of Wilkes to "recommend strongly to his government, to claim the whole of the territory on the Pacific from the Mexican northern boundary in Lat. 42° to the Russian southern boundary in Lat. 54° 40'". Letters of Sir George Simpson, AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 86.

⁶³ On the changed tone toward America with the incoming of Peel's administration, see Everett to the Department of State, December 28, 1841. MS. Archives of the American Embassy, London, volume VII. Although the Congressional discussions on Oregon and the "Fifty-Four-Forty-or-Fight" slogan of the Demo-

when Peel's administration began and who remained there till the summer of 1845, expressed in a series of despatches during that time his conviction that the British government was disposed to a friendly settlement of the Oregon question on reasonable terms.⁶⁴ They felt bound, indeed, in view of the historical attitude of their government, not to accept any offer which did not in some respects go beyond what had been offered and specifically declined by Canning's government in 1826-1827. But, on the other hand, they did not expect the United States, any more than themselves, to now accept what they had once rejected.⁶⁵ The problem, from their viewpoint, was to induce the American government to accept, with modifications rendering it more liberal, the Columbia River boundary, or to offer liberal modifications of their proposed boundary on the forty-ninth parallel basis.

It was in this spirit that Lord Aberdeen wrote his instructions to Richard Pakenham (afterwards Sir Richard) when that gentleman was dispatched to Washington at the opening of the year 1844 to conduct a negotiation for the settlement of the Oregon question.⁶⁶

cratic campaign of 1844 need not be taken too seriously as an index of American hostility, President Polk's inaugural declaration, in March, 1845, that our title to the *whole of Oregon* was "clear and unquestionable" must be regarded as the reverse of conciliatory.

⁶⁴ See, for example, Everett's no. 69 to the Department of State, dated London, December 2, 1843. Despatches to the Department of State, VIII. Aberdeen declared in an interview with Everett on November 29, 1843, that "there must be concession on both sides that they were willing to act on that principle and that we must do the same." Everett says: "it is the result of the closest consideration I have been able to give it, that the present government, though of course determined not to make any discreditable sacrifice of what they consider their rights, are really willing to agree to reasonable terms of settlement." Everett's idea of what would be "reasonable" is almost exactly expressed by the treaty as finally concluded. See also Everett's no. 106 of April 1, 1844.

⁶⁵ See Everett's nos. 69 and 106, *ubi supra*.

⁶⁶ No. 10, Aberdeen to Pakenham, December 28, 1843. The British government showed more anxiety to settle the question, after Ashburton's failure, than did our own government. Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel both expressed to Everett their regret that it had been left over and their desire to proceed without delay to its adjustment. See Everett's no. 19, of August 4, 1842. Also Everett to Webster, October 19, 1842. *Berlin Arbitration*, p. 27. "Lord Aberdeen, in the conference which ensued after the exchange of the ratifications, observed that his only object of regret in connection with the [Ashburton] treaty was that the boundary between the two countries on the Pacific Ocean had not been provided for; and expressed a strong wish that I might receive instructions on that subject." Aberdeen instructed Mr. Fox, October 18, 1842, to urge upon the American government to enter upon a new negotiation at London, through Mr. Everett, for the settlement of that question. The American government received the overture with formal friendliness but in no hearty spirit. President Tyler was in no haste to settle it. See Tyler to Calhoun, October 7, 1845, in "Correspondence of John C. Calhoun", *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for*

He begins now with "the last proposition made by the British negotiators in 1826", namely, the Columbia River boundary to the sea, modified by the offer of a port or ports and detached portion of territory north of the Columbia. Aberdeen felt "bound at once to declare that Her Majesty's government would not be found disposed to sanction any further cession of territory". But, if the American government should reject that offer—as he obviously expected they would—Pakenham might in addition offer "to convert into a free port any other harbour either on the mainland or on Vancouver's Island, south of 49° north latitude, which the United States government might desire. You may even advance one step farther, and . . . declare that Her Majesty's government would be willing to make all the ports within De Fuca's inlet and south of the 49th parallel of latitude, free ports." Should this extreme concession be rejected, he was to propose that the question of the northwestern boundary be submitted to the arbitration of some friendly state or sovereign; and should that offer also be declined, to propose a further extension for ten years of the joint-occupation agreement.

This letter was official; it expressed the views of the government as those views were controlled by considerations of party and national prejudice. It does not properly exhibit the private views of Lord Aberdeen, and probably not those of the cabinet in general. For among Aberdeen's private papers is the copy of a letter addressed by him to Pakenham on March 4, 1844, which not only proves that he did not expect the American government to accept the concessions authorized, but contains in addition the following remarkable suggestion:

Should my apprehensions be verified, you will endeavor, without committing yourself or your gov't, to draw from the American negotiator a proposal to make the 49th degree of latitude the boundary, with the proviso that the ports to the south of that parallel to the Columbia inclusive, shall be free ports to G. Britain. The navigation of the Columbia should be common to both; and care should be taken that the 49th degree of latitude, as a boundary, is to extend only *to the sea*; and not to apply to Vancouver's Island.

Such a proposal, coming from the American government, might be favorably considered by the British cabinet, though he is not sure

1899, p. 1059. Webster was nursing his "tripartite" plan, which he hoped would take himself to London as a special ambassador in the summer of 1843. See Fox to Aberdeen, February 24, 1843, F. O. Am. 391. The special mission failed, Webster retired from the Cabinet, and on October 8, 1843, Secretary Upshur sent Everett instructions to open the negotiation in London. But by that time Aberdeen had arranged to send Pakenham to Washington.

that it would be accepted. Aberdeen himself thinks it would be a reasonable compromise.⁶⁷

We shall not be far wrong in inferring from the above letter, that by this time the question before the British cabinet was how to convince Parliament and the nation that the abandonment of the Columbia River boundary—Canning's boundary—was a political necessity unless Great Britain was ready to accept the stern arbitrament of war. This ultimate fact had been borne in upon the government from several directions. First, Mr. Everett in London, than whom no American minister has ever been in higher personal favor with the cabinet, insisted strongly, in repeated interviews with Lord Aberdeen, that the American government would never consent to abandon the forty-ninth parallel as a basis, and that the only modification of that boundary which could be hoped for would be to allow the line to run through Fuca's Straits to the ocean instead of extending it across the southern end of Vancouver's Island.⁶⁸ Mr. Pakenham, meantime, was writing in the same spirit from the American capital. When, after a long delay on the part of the American government, he at last secured an interview with Calhoun, the new Secretary of State, on the subject of Oregon, he was promptly assured that even if the Secretary could bring himself to accept a less advantageous boundary than that on the forty-ninth parallel, "it would be idle to propose such an arrangement to the Senate for that it most *certainly would not be ratified*."⁶⁹ Moreover, after it became clear that no boundary treaty was possible on the terms to which he was limited, Pakenham convinced himself that it would be practically useless to propose either arbitration or the extension for ten years longer of the joint-occupation principle; for the Senate, as he justly concluded, would not be disposed to agree to either of these expedients, even though the government might under extreme circumstances do so.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ The author is indebted for this and other private correspondence of Lord Aberdeen to the courtesy of Lord Stanmore, his son, whose library at the Red House, Ascot, is the repository of the Aberdeen papers.

⁶⁸ Everett urged this point in the interviews reported in his nos. 69 and 106 above, that is, on November 29, 1843, and March 16, 1844, also in other interviews, as that reported in his no. 82, of February 2, 1844.

⁶⁹ No. 88, Pakenham to Aberdeen, August 29, 1844, F. O. Am. 407. The italics are mine. Pakenham and Calhoun discussed the Oregon question formally between the dates August 22 and September 24. The papers are found in print in *Correspondence relative to the . . . Oregon Territory subsequent to the Treaty of Washington* (London, 1846; government blue book).

⁷⁰ No. 134, to Aberdeen, December 12, 1844, F. O. Am. 409. Also no. 40, to Aberdeen, December 29, 1844, *ibid*. Pakenham found Calhoun strongly disinclined to discuss arbitration except as a last resort. See above, no. 140; also

On the passing of Tyler's administration and the incoming of Mr. Polk, with Buchanan as Secretary of State, the situation became, from the British viewpoint, still more dubious. Polk had been elected on a platform declaring for the whole of Oregon ("Fifty-Four-Forty-or-Fight"), and in his inaugural address he asserted his belief that our right to the territory as a whole was "clear and unquestionable". Though Buchanan undertook to resume the negotiation, Pakenham believed him to be intent mainly on wringing from Great Britain humiliating concessions and not sincerely anxious to end the dispute by honorable compromise.⁷¹ In fact, although there is no reason to suppose that our government really desired war with Great Britain, the tone which they assumed in regard to Oregon was unquestionably higher and less conciliatory than that of their predecessors in office. In this the government reflected public opinion as exhibited both in and out of Congress. There was no reason to expect the popular zeal for Oregon to abate, and the wise course for Great Britain was to seize the first opportunity to settle the question honorably.⁷²

In the critical weeks following our final rejection of arbitration, February 4, 1846, a growing sense of responsibility sobered all branches of the American government. The President allowed it to become known in England that he would not refuse to submit to the Senate, for their previous advice, a proposition for a boundary based upon the forty-ninth parallel and De Fuca's Strait; but that he was Calhoun to Pakenham, January 21, 1845, enclosure 2 in Pakenham to Aberdeen, no. 22, *Corr. rel. to Oregon Terr.*, p. 31. Aberdeen, in an instruction to Pakenham dated April 3, 1845, cancelled his earlier instruction to secure an extension of the joint-occupation principle for ten years. See *Berlin Arbitration*, p. 223. The attempt to secure a submission of the question to arbitration was several times renewed, always unsuccessfully. The final rejection of this proposition came on February 4, 1846.

⁷¹ See Pakenham's no. 95, F. O. Am. 428, dated September 13, 1845; on the connection of the Oregon question with the outbreak of a prospective war with Mexico, no. 102, F. O. Am. 428, dated September 28, 1845 (especially the "private and confidential" inclosed); see also nos. 114 and 115, F. O. Am. 429, of October 29, 1845. On the course of the negotiation, see his no. 60 of May 29, F. O. Am. 426; no. 87, F. O. Am. 427, dated July 29; and the above nos. 102, 114, 115, and 119 (with "private and confidential" inclosed). The formal papers passed between Pakenham and Buchanan are printed in *Corr. rel. to Ore. Terr.*, and in J. B. Moore, ed., *Works of James Buchanan*, VI. 194, 212, 231. See also, for the government's view, Buchanan to McLane, *ibid.*, 186.

⁷² No. 21, Pakenham to Aberdeen, March 17, 1846, F. O. Am. 447, discusses the probable attitude of the next Congress on the Oregon question. His forecast agrees with that of Buchanan in his letter (private) to McLane of February 26, 1846, *Works*, VI. 386. The emigration of Americans to Oregon, and the necessity of extending the laws of the United States over that country, are facts of great significance, as Buchanan thinks: "the question must be settled peaceably within the year, or war may be the consequence."

unalterably opposed to yielding in perpetuity to British subjects the free navigation of the Columbia River.⁷³ Aberdeen waited with some trepidation⁷⁴ until Congress also displayed evidences of a conciliatory disposition,⁷⁵ when he instructed Pakenham to present a project of a treaty which made the boundary the forty-ninth parallel and Fuca's Strait, granted to the Hudson's Bay Company the right to navigate the Columbia,⁷⁶ and guaranteed the possessory rights of that company and the Puget Sound Agricultural Company south of the forty-ninth parallel.⁷⁷ The Senate, on June 12, by a vote of 37 to 12, advised the President to accept the British proposal, which was done, and the treaty was concluded on June 15 in the exact form in which the proposal came from Aberdeen's hand.

JOSEPH SCHAFER.

⁷³ See Buchanan to McLane (private), February 26, 1846. *Buchanan's Works*, VI. 385-387.

⁷⁴ Aberdeen wrote privately to Pakenham, May 4, 1846, saying, "the evils of delay . . . would be very serious if I thought that Congress should rise before the arrival of my proposition."

⁷⁵ In passing under a conciliatory form the resolution to give notice of the abrogation of the joint-occupation agreement.

⁷⁶ The Senate was convinced that the right would terminate with the expiration of the company's charter, May 30, 1859. See Buchanan to Clay, June 13, 1846. *Works*, VII. 10.

⁷⁷ See the treaty, in *Treaties, Conventions, etc., of the United States* (1910), I. 656.

THE SCANDINAVIAN ELEMENT IN AMERICAN POPULATION¹

Of the present population of the United States probably not less than three million persons are of pure Scandinavian stock, counting both the hundreds of thousands of Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish immigrants now living, and the descendants in the second and third generation of these and other immigrants of earlier years. As a considerable factor in the flight of the Teutonic tribes from Europe to America in the nineteenth century, a study of the native qualities of the Scandinavian immigrants, their numbers, and their motives in transplanting themselves to new soil, would be instructive. Of more immediate and vital concern, however, are the consequences to the Republic, which have followed their settlement, for it is obvious that the social and economic meaning of these seven figures would be vastly different if they stood for the same number of gambling gypsies, Chinese coolies, Mexican peons, or recruits from the proletariat of the south or west of Europe.

The final test of the value of any alien element in the population of a nation must always be its capacity for amalgamation with the better part of the adopting country, its ability and willingness to contribute positively and progressively to the upbuilding of the institutions and spirit of the nation whose life it shares. The Scandinavians have so often shown an exceptional power of adaptability in matters social and political that their large participation in the immigration movement from Europe during the last sixty years makes reasonable the presumption of large benefits to accrue from their coming to America. One of the great advantages which they possess for the enrichment of their chosen country lies in the freedom and education under which they have grown up in the Northern kingdoms, and in the fact that they have brought with them scanty luggage of social distinctions, class traditions, and ecclesiastical obligations.

The Swedish colony on the Delaware River in the middle of the seventeenth century, content in its quiet frontier plenty, was a significant forerunner of the great hosts of their emigrating kinsmen

¹The substance of this paper was read at the New York meeting of the American Historical Association, December 31, 1909.

of the nineteenth century. Nearly fifty years after the founding of this colony of the Swedish crown, William Penn commented on its prosperity, and added: "They have fine children, and almost every house full: rare to find one of them without three or four boys and as many girls; some six, seven, and eight sons. And I must do them that right, I see few young men more sober and laborious."² But the narrow Atlantic coast was not to be the site of the New Sweden. Complications of European politics and the undeveloped state of the right of expatriation postponed for two hundred years the exodus of the children of the North, till finally, in the course of migration events, rare and attractive opportunities in the newer and vaster American West combined with industrial unrest in the northern peninsulas of Europe to produce a veritable army of emigrants who scrupled little to leave the three Norse kingdoms and enlist as citizens under a foreign flag.

This immigration reached its high-water mark in 1882, when more than 105,000 Scandinavians reached America, the major part of them going directly into the West, very few stopping east of Chicago. Another period of prosperity in the Upper Mississippi Valley, quite as much industrial as agricultural, produced another record of 77,000 of the same sort of immigrants in 1903, but by no means so large a proportion of them went into the agricultural sections of the Northwest as in the earlier decades.

The longing for land, the determination to own a farm at the earliest possible moment, is the most significant fact in the story of the influence of Scandinavian immigration to the United States. The call of the wild, rich, boundless western prairie, to be had in quarter sections, almost for the asking, with water and wood and fish and game near by, fell upon eager hearts in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, where the areas of good land were narrowly limited by nature, subjected to many customary restrictions, and to be purchased, if purchasable at all, only with a great price in money and effort. The words of the call came in familiar tongues, in letters from adventurers into the new West, in interviews with prosperous immigrants who returned to visit their old home parishes, in circulars and in immigrant guide-books sent out by states, counties, railroads, and land companies. Agents were sent like missionaries to preach enthusiastically and effectively the gospel of Minnesota's or Wisconsin's or Dakota's industrial and agricultural advantages. The appeal was quite as much to the imagination as to the understanding; the response was made by the bravest, sturdiest, and most

² Janney, *Life of William Penn*, p. 236.

ambitious. The inspiration, the release of spiritual energies, and the development of new powers of activity and effort, in the process of adjustment to American conditions, have been potent, persistent, subtle social factors, affecting two generations of the immigrants and their children's children of two more generations. Thus it came about that the prospective joys of owning a farm and of expanding its acreage, with the prosperity of the years and with the growth of the family, made the hardships of pioneering and the isolation of the frontier seem as very little things to the strong-limbed, sound-hearted, land-hungry Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes in the middle Northwest, as compared with their more gregarious cousins of western and southern Europe, who sought American cities, construction gangs, or mining camps.

The Norwegian immigration was the earliest, attaining considerable proportions in the late thirties and early forties of the last century, when Illinois and Wisconsin were bidding loudly for settlers, with Chicago and Milwaukee as competing ports of entry for fresh importations. Here grew up, especially in Dane, Jefferson, and Rock counties in southeastern Wisconsin, strong Norwegian colonies typical of later settlements, towards which later comers directed their steps and in which they rested for a few weeks or worked for a few months before seeking a permanent location where good land was cheaper than in the partially occupied regions. The Swedish movement, beginning with a small colony in Wisconsin in 1841, got its first large impetus in the Jansonist communistic-religious settlement in Henry County in Illinois between 1846 and 1850. By 1860 both the Swedes and the Norwegians were pushing into Minnesota and Iowa in large numbers. The four states just named claimed the bulk of the Viking immigrants for the next two decades. But good land at the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre was growing scarce even in Minnesota, and about 1880 Nebraska and the Dakotas were annexed to the new Scandinavia. In this manner was realized the prophetic vision of Frederika Bremer, the Swedish authoress and traveller, whose striking words, written in St. Paul in 1850, and published in her *Homes of the New World*, were widely read by her countrymen in Europe:

What a glorious new Scandinavia might not Minnesota become! Here would the Swede find again his clear, romantic lakes, the plains of Scania rich in corn, and the vallies of Norrland; here would the Norwegian find his rapid rivers, his lofty mountains, for I include the Rocky Mountains and Oregon in the new kingdom; and both nations, their hunting-fields and their fisheries. The Danes might here pasture their flocks and herds, and lay out their farms on richer and less misty

coasts than those of Denmark. . . . Scandinavians who are well off in the old country ought not to leave it. But such as are too much contracted at home, and who desire to emigrate, should come to Minnesota. The climate, the situation, the character of the scenery agrees with our people better than that of any other of the American States, and none of them appear to me to have a greater or a more beautiful future before them than Minnesota.³

This strong, normal movement of a mature, educated, purposeful people into the agricultural areas of the Upper Mississippi and Red River valleys naturally resulted in the grouping together of companies of Norwegians or Swedes or Danes in certain counties, just as, at a later time, there occurred a similar segregation by wards and precincts in the cities, when the percentage of artisans among the immigrants increased, and when the cities absorbed a larger proportion of the new arrivals. In this way Dane and Jefferson counties in Wisconsin, Winneshiek County in Iowa, Freeborn, Fillmore, Ottertail, and Goodhue counties in Minnesota, and Cass, Traill, and Grand Forks counties in North Dakota are strongly Norwegian; Winnebago in Illinois, Douglas and Burnett in Wisconsin, Chisago, Wright, and Nicollet in Minnesota are Swedish counties; while the Danes are numerous in Pottawatomie and Shelby counties in Iowa, Howard in Nebraska, and Pembina in North Dakota. In some of the newer counties, like Burnett and Polk in Wisconsin, Pope in Minnesota, and Griggs in North Dakota, the foreign-born Scandinavians in 1900 were very nearly one-fourth of the total population, and those of the second generation, native-born, were nearly another fourth.

In the city-ward movement of the last thirty years, the Scandinavians, immigrant and native-born, have taken part, and as a result, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha, and Rockford have large sections where the Swedish, Norwegian, or Danish elements predominate. In fact, Chicago ranks fourth among the cities of the world in its population of purely Scandinavian birth, while in the number of Swedes it ranks third. After liberal allowance has been made for this later movement to the cities, it appears from the census figures of 1900 that not above one-fifth of the persons of pure Norse blood in the United States live in cities of 25,000 population or over.

The comparative significance of this steady tendency of the immigrants from Northern Europe to go into agricultural sections may be roughly estimated in figures. Of the native Americans, one out of six engages in agriculture in some capacity; of the Germans in the United States, one out of seven; of the Irish, one out of twelve;

³ Bremer, *Homes of the New World*, II. 314-315.

while one out of every four of the Scandinavians may be classed as an agriculturist. Professor J. R. Commons, in the *Report of the Industrial Commission*, carries out the comparison even more strikingly, showing that the percentages of males "On Farms" in 1890 were: Danes 40 per cent., Swedes and Norwegians 38, Germans 27, Irish 14.7, Italians 5.8, and Hungarians 3.9.⁴

Another strong inducement offered by the West to the Scandinavian immigrants, besides the abundance of good lands, especially in the periods 1840-1860, 1870-1890, and 1898-1907, was the great demand, and high wages paid, for intelligent labor. Since many of the new arrivals had no capital beyond their accumulations of physical strength and common-sense, they must first serve at whatever tasks they could find, until enough money was saved to give them a start on their own farms. In the first two periods mentioned all the western states were exceedingly anxious to obtain settlers for their unoccupied lands, and the farmers who should take them up needed helpers. The construction of internal improvements like the out-reaching railroad systems could be carried on only by the aid of an abundance of laborers, who were not likely to be supplied to any considerable degree from the eastern states, for there the development of manufacturing and of transportation by land and sea was operating to keep up wages and to hold the laborer. The hard labor of the West and Farther West, therefore, must be done, if done at all, by those who had not already found their places in the industrial system of the country. For such services good wages, according to Eastern standards, were readily paid; according to Swedish and Norwegian standards, the wages were astonishingly liberal.

Experienced agricultural laborers in the Northwest about 1870 received nearly three times as high wages as the corresponding classes in Northern Europe, while the ratio for skilled labor was still higher.⁵ Even after the panic of 1873 the ratio remained nearly three to one in favor of the American scale. Such wages attracted many laborers, but not all were content to remain mere wage-earners. If they were men who would become permanent settlers when the railroad on whose construction gangs they worked was finished, and if they should desire earnestly to occupy vacant agricultural land tributary to the railroad, or perchance owned by the railroad company itself as a grant made by the government in aid of its building, so much the better for the railroad, for the county, and for the state as a whole. The Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes proved to be just the men wanted; they entered in and possessed the land.

⁴ *Report of the Industrial Commission*, XV. 301, 302.

⁵ Young, *Labor in Europe and America*, pp. 676, 696, 739.

The process thus described was repeated over and over again, in the building of the Rock Island Railroad through western Illinois, the Northern Pacific through Minnesota and North Dakota, and what is now the Great Northern northwest from St. Paul, through the Red River Valley, and across Dakota. The by-products of permanent settlement of railroad laborers in townships adjacent to the new line were vastly more important than the original services, and in striking contrast to the infinitesimal results of the same sort which followed where the construction was done, as in later instances, by Italians, Greeks, Poles, or Mexicans. The nuclei of Scandinavian settlements planted in this way along the new railroads of the middle Northwest were sure to grow, and the promoters of those great systems spared no pains or expense to attract such substantial settlers as the Swedes and Norwegians were found to be. The corporations offered real bargains, and they found thousands ready to snap them up. It might be truly said that it was faith in human nature, and especially in Swedish and Norwegian human nature, which led to the construction and profitable operation of hundreds of miles of railroads in Minnesota and the Dakotas without any subsidy whatever of land or bonds.

President James J. Hill of the Great Northern Railway Company, which was built without any land-grant, gave a concrete and very striking illustration of the results of this faith and of the cumulative economic contribution of the Scandinavian settlers, in a speech in 1902 in Crookston, in northern Minnesota, in the midst of a great Scandinavian region. For comparison with towns of North Dakota, he said,

I took the best towns [of the Red River Valley] outside of Crookston. . . . I will give you the annual business. Warren's last year's railroad business with our company was \$86,000; Hallock, \$94,000, a respectable sum; Stephen, \$87,000; Ada, \$81,000 . . . Langdon [in North Dakota] . . . away up towards the boundary, upon Pembina Mountain, \$210,000; Osnabrock, I hardly know where it is myself, \$101,000; Park River, \$170,000; Rolla, \$127,000; . . . Bottineau, away at the west end of the Turtle Mountains, where a few years ago people said it was too far away; could not live there and could not raise anything if they did live there, \$258,000.*

The transformation of the wilderness into farms and gardens, by Swedes as in Chisago County, and by Norwegians as in Goodhue and Ottertail counties, in Minnesota, finds its counterpart in hundreds of localities. The figures for assessments and valuations year by year are eloquent testimony to the value of Scandinavian energy, strength, and thrift in the Northwestern commonwealths. Unim-

* *Northwest Magazine*, XX. 7-11.

proved areas diminish, and the class of "farm lands" expands surprisingly. The cash value of farms rises rapidly, along with the value of improvements. In two typical counties just named the increase in this cash value of farms was, for Chisago County, from \$1,171,426 in 1880 to \$2,563,630 in 1890, and for Ottertail County, from \$151,282 in 1870, to \$3,650,223 in 1880, to \$8,511,465 in 1890, and to \$12,478,640 in 1900.⁷ No one was crowded out or kept from coming into possession of what should have been his by any prior right in this creation of wealth. Notwithstanding the homestead law and the flat price of \$1.25 for public land, the land really went to the highest bidder, to the man who was willing to invest those primary essentials of success in agriculture—muscle, courage, intelligence, patience, and the future of himself and his children. Many a time success came so quickly that the Norse settler sold out his improved farm, moved to a new frontier, and reinvested himself and his capital in a larger venture, sometimes repeating the operation twice. No small part of the stability and soundness of North Dakota is due to men of this very class, who, coming from Iowa, Wisconsin, or Minnesota, combined experience, capital, and shrewdness in acquiring and developing new farms, and who in their ripe old age found themselves possessed of goodly estates, with grown sons and daughters well established in their own homes near by.

The eagerness for land-owning and the willingness to pay for it in the vital terms of hard work and courageous thrift has had far-reaching influence upon the political activity and citizenship of the Scandinavians. The period of service as a laborer was an apprenticeship in American ways; some knowledge of English was acquired; methods of business were gradually learned; land laws, regulations of transportation, and the process of naturalization were studied. With completed naturalization and the acquisition of land the journeyman stage was entered upon, and the liking for public affairs, particularly strong in the Norwegian, whose homeland has long been the most democratic of the Norse kingdoms, might be indulged almost indefinitely. Loving independence and freedom, and hating slavery cordially, the large numbers who settled in the Northwest in the ten years before the Civil War were almost inevitably allied with the anti-slavery movement and consequently with the Republican party at its formation, the "party of high moral ideas" as they liked to call it long after it ceased to merit that noble description.

The growth of agricultural settlements along the advancing frontier compelled early and continual training in the soundest principles

⁷ Reports of the United States Census.

and practices of American democracy, not for a few but for practically all the adult males. The purchasing of land required knowledge of federal laws and brought contact with federal officials. If the settlers had a post-office they must secure and operate it and the post-route, all under governmental direction. The towns and counties must be organized, and later there would be subdivision of these. The machinery of elections and local administration must be understood and made to work. The public school, almost invariably conducted in English from the start, was an early and willing responsibility. The levying and collecting of taxes, and the laying out of roads must be provided for. Over and over again these things were done well and promptly by men in whose veins coursed none but Norse blood; except for the peculiar names of men and towns, one would not suspect from the records that the town-makers were not born in Massachusetts or New York. In some cases more than one-fifth of the men of the community shared at first in the actual administration of town affairs. In the towns of Arendahl and Norway, in Fillmore County, Minnesota, all the officers at the first election, in 1860, were Norwegians; in the town of New Sweden, in the same state, four years later, thirty votes were cast at the first election, and six Swedes and four Norwegians filled all the offices.⁸ Twenty years, and even forty years, later these offices were filled in about the same way. In 1901 the town of Stoughton, Wisconsin, one of the oldest and richest of the Norwegian settlements, was officered by a mayor and seven councilmen of Norwegian birth or descent. In county affairs the same activity is to be observed during the last thirty years; Traill County, North Dakota, and Lac qui Parle and Yellow Medicine counties, Minnesota, elected in 1904 seven or eight Scandinavians out of a possible ten in the county offices.⁹ In 1893 one-fourth of all the sheriffs, treasurers, and registers of deeds in Minnesota and one-sixth of those of North Dakota were Scandinavians, approximately the same ratio as this element bore to the total population of the states.

But the Scandinavian as a journeyman in politics was not content; he would enter the rank of masters by sharing in state and national affairs and honors. He was a citizen, a man of property, education, and honesty; with many others of his nationality he had given honorable service in the Federal armies during the war; he soon offered a good record as an efficient county officer—and his countrymen were a numerous, ambitious, independent, and sensitive

⁸ *History of Fillmore County*, pp. 346, 376, 378, 392; *History of the Minnesota Valley*, pp. 688, 690.

⁹ *Amerika*, November 18, 1904.

company. They were apt pupils in the American school of practical politics. So early as 1870, the editor of a Norwegian newspaper in southern Minnesota declared that it was time for the 8000 Norwegian voters in that Congressional district to get a Representative in Congress, "just as well as other nationalities"—the Irish, for example—and he suggested a Norwegian convention, to be held the day before the regular Republican convention. Then if the Republicans refused "recognition", put on the screws!¹⁰ Twenty years later "the Scandinavians of North Dakota in mass convention assembled" organized the Scandinavian Union of North Dakota, to secure for themselves "that share in the government which their competency, their character, and numerical strength, and their rank as pioneers in all matters of civilization entitle them".¹¹ The chairman of this convention, Hon. M. N. Johnson, was later elected a Representative in Congress, and then United States Senator from North Dakota.

In Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas, it is now taken for granted that the state tickets, and very many of the county and municipal tickets will "recognize" the Scandinavian voters by nominating some of their number. Thus it has come about that Minnesota has had four Scandinavian governors and Wisconsin one, with many other administrative officers. Thirteen Scandinavians have been Representatives in Congress, two have reached the United States Senate, and several have attained ministerial rank in the diplomatic service as a reward for loyal and efficient party activity. But it must in fairness be said that the dignity, prestige, and repeated successes of such men as Senator Knute Nelson and Governor John A. Johnson of Minnesota were the result of real ability and genuine Americanism rather than of adventitious political advantage arising out of Scandinavian origin.

The party affiliations of the Scandinavian voters, broadly speaking, have been steadily Republican ever since the organization of that party, but the leaven of independent voting, beginning with the first defection, about 1880, to the Greenback party, has worked with uncertain periodicity and varying strength. Here it is the Free-silver heresy which divides them, as it did other classes of voters; there it is the Farmers' Alliance or the Populist principle. Again, a law for compulsory education, in the English language—the Bennett Law of 1889 in Wisconsin—led to a strange temporary alliance between the Irish and German Roman Catholics on the one hand

¹⁰ *Fædrelandet og Emigranten*, June 9, 30, 1870.

¹¹ *The North*, July 10, 1889, translating from *Posten og Vesten*.

and the Scandinavian Lutherans on the other, and the election of a Democratic governor in Wisconsin. Each such excursion from the old parties, though followed by a return of the majority to the old allegiance, has strengthened the tendency to independent voting until at the present time, upon questions like the tariff, currency, and legislation for control of railroads and other great corporations, and local option or prohibition, the Scandinavian independent vote makes any election in the middle Northwest a matter of real uncertainty. Roosevelt carried Minnesota by a plurality of 161,000, yet Johnson, the Swedish Democratic candidate for governor, was elected by a small plurality. In 1908 Minnesota re-elected Johnson for a third term by a plurality of 20,000, at the same time giving Taft 85,000.

Turning to the effect of the Scandinavian element upon society in general, it is safe to say that in no case, save perhaps in the matter of the percentage of insane in state hospitals, has it exercised any disintegrating or retarding influence. The statistics of crime and pauperism for the six states containing Scandinavians in great numbers are strikingly favorable; the percentage of offences due to intemperance is not notably higher in such Scandinavian counties as Chisago and Goodhue in Minnesota, or in cities like Rockford, Illinois, and Madison, Wisconsin, or in the densely Scandinavian wards of Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, than in similar areas peopled by Germans or native Americans. The deep and abiding loyalty of the Norwegians and Swedes to the public-school system has been noteworthy since the early days of their settlement. While in a very few instances the Lutheran church has attempted year-long parish schools, it has usually confined itself to vacation schools for instruction in religion and the mother tongue, and to attempts to build up seminaries and colleges for advanced instruction under the direction of the various branches into which the Lutheran church, especially among the Norwegians, has become divided.

The Scandinavian immigrants, from the beginnings of their movement into the promise of the American West, have dedicated themselves, without reservation and without stipulation, to the interests and institutions of the Republic. Neither educational nor property qualifications, nor any other reasonable restrictions on immigration, would much affect the number of arrivals. They come to the New World to stay and to make homes in the old-fashioned sense of the word; they are racially akin to the best in America; they are mentally and temperamentally detached from Old World dogmas, castes, and animosities; they are educated, hard-working, ambitious, and law-abiding, and permanently quickened by the conditions of

American life. Their contribution to the social structure of the commonwealth will be strength and stability rather than beauty and the delicate refinements of culture. They are not likely to furnish great leaders, but they will be in the front rank of those who follow men of light and of spiritual force. They will be builders and contributors, not destroyers; their greatest and most enduring services will be as a subtle, steadying influence, reinforcing those high qualities which are sometimes called Puritan, sometimes American, but which in any case make for local and national peace, prosperity, enlightenment, and righteousness.

KENDRIC CHARLES BABCOCK.

DOCUMENTS

I. Documents relating to the Mississippi Land Company, 1763-1769.

THE following documents, found among the Earl of Chatham's papers,¹ serve to illustrate one phase of the movement for the colonization of the West in the eighteenth century. Immediately after the announcement of the formal cession of the West to Great Britain in February, 1763, a number of companies were organized for the purpose of exploiting the territory. Among these was the Mississippi Land Company, in which George Washington, the Virginia Lees, and a number of prominent merchants and planters of the colonies of Virginia and Maryland were interested. The proposed colony, the exact boundaries of which are printed elsewhere,² was to comprise two million five hundred thousand acres situated in the present states of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. The efforts of the company to secure a grant were temporarily checked in the year of its organization by the issuance of the royal proclamation of 1763, designed to pacify the western Indians by reserving to them the territory west of the Alleghany Mountains. After 1767 the opposition of certain members of the ministry, notably Lord Hillsborough, who were not persuaded of the utility of such colonies, successfully circumvented the efforts of the company and its friends. By 1770 activity on the part of the company appears to have ceased.

CLARENCE E. CARTER.

WESTMORELAND COURT HOUSE, VIRGINIA.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Mississippi Company Sept. 26th 1763.

Present

Richard Henry Lee, Francis Lightfoot Lee, Rich. Parker, John Aug. Washington, W^m Booth, being members of the Committee,³ and also Charles Digges, George Simpson and W^m Beale Junr.⁴

¹ The bundle of papers relating to the Mississippi Company bears the following endorsement: "Mississippi Co^s. Papers, sent to the Right Honble William Earl of Chatham, On Saturday the 20th of April, 1774." The papers are in the Public Record Office, London. They are declared by an endorsement to be all in the handwriting of William Lee.

² The boundaries are described in the memorial of the company, dated September, 1763. See documentary appendix to *Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 1763-1774* (Washington, 1910), by C. E. Carter.

³ A committee of ten members was to meet twice each year to transact necessary business. See A. B. Hulbert, "Original Articles of Agreement", in *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications*, XVII. 438.

⁴ Any member of the company was given the right to vote in committee meetings should he happen to be present. *Ibid.*

A Letter to Mr. Thos. Cumming by order of the Company being prepared and approved is as followeth:

VIRGINIA Sept. 26th, 1763.

Sir,

We are now to inform you that a number of Gentlemen of this Colony and the Province of Maryland, many of them your particular acquaintances, have projected a Scheme for taking up a Considerable Tract of Land on a navigable part of the Mississippi and some of its dependencies. That for this purpose they have formed themselves into a Company by the name of the Mississippi Company and have agreed to such Articles and Rules for the better executing their plan, as the nature of the thing suggested to them. Of which, together with their subsequent proceedings you will herewith receive a Copy where you will perceive that we are directed to propose to you to become one of the Company and to desire that you will be pleased to procure so many subscribers to the Scheme, as will amount to nine, of such influence and fortunes as may be likely to promote its success. The particular spot chosen by the Company you will find by the Memorial lies on the River Mississippi, a considerable way above and below the confluence of Ohio therewith; and extending from the Mississippi into the Country Eastward and Southward so as to comprehend the quantity they want, on the first mentioned River, and its great branches, Wabash, Ohio and Cherokee Rivers. Many reasons have contributed to the choice of this place; such as the goodness of the navigation from thence to the Gulph of Mexico, the fineness of the climate, it being in about 38 Degrees of North Latitude, the country level, and the soil from unquestionable Intelligence, as fertile as any on the Globe. These powerful inducements cannot fail to effect a speedy Settlement of this Country which must render the share of each Adventurer extremely valuable.

The benefit then to be derived to the Company, being so probable, it remains only to obtain if possible, from the Crown a Grant to the Company (by the name of the Mississippi Company) for such Lands and on such Terms, as they have proposed in their Memorial.⁵ For their Success in this point they rely on you, and as they are conscious that solicitations of this sort are attended with expense, to defray this they present you with an hundred Guineas.

The Company would choose to have their Memorial laid before the King, so soon as you shall find it expedient to do so, from having previously conciliated the favor of the Ministry thereto. And if you find that it is to be attended with success, you are desired to give the Committee the most early intelligence, and at the same time to inform them what expense will arise from the suing out of Letters Patent, that they may immediately call a meeting of the Company to raise the requisite sum.

But in the meantime you are to proceed as far as the nature of the thing will admit in suing out such Letters Patent. The Company choose Letters Patent rather than a Mandamus for the Colony, because so many persons of the first influence here, are concerned in Land Schemes; that a thousand nameless, artful obstructions would be thrown into their way to prevent the success of their enterprize.

⁵ For terms see the original articles of agreement printed by A. B. Huibert, in *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications*, XVII. 436, and the memorial of the company, dated September 9, 1763, printed in documentary appendix of *Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 1763-1774*.

Also it is desired that a warrant for survey shall be solicited from the Crown and left blank to be filled up with the name of such Surveyor as the Company can agree with to do their business on the cheapest terms, because the legal fees here are so oppressive, that the expence of surveying the Company's Grant would be insupportably great. But this application need not be made untill the Letters Patent be obtained.

It is apprehended that considerable difficulties will attend the attainment of the Grant we request, and for these reasons which have been urged here, as prevailing with you: First that the Grants of large Tracts of Land prevent the poorer sort of people from settling by the previous engrossing of the Soil. However plausible this may appear in theory, the contrary has been found true in practice.

It having been discovered from experience, that Land taken up by Companys may be retailed by them to Individuals, in such a manner as to profit the taker up, and yet the purchaser from him, obtain his Land cheaper than he could himself possibly have taken it up originally, because where a large quantity of Land is to be surveyed, an artist can be obtained to do the whole business, for a much less Sum, than the survey of the same quantity would cost a number of individuals having distinct property in it, and employing different Surveyors. Add to this the heavy charges that arise from the taking out so many different patents, the expence of traveling and attending offices, and lastly the utter ignorance the poorer sort labor under of the proper methods to be taken in the solicitation of patents, and their inability to advance ready money for such purposes. All which is removed by the method we propose, as we carry people immediately to the spot, invite others to come, and give them deeds to the Lands they want on reasonable terms, and credit given them until they by their industry become enabled to pay for their purchases. But in answer to all this it is urged, that what we propose to do, may be done at the expense and under the immediate protection of the Government. It is very true that if the Country proposed to be settled was not of very large extent, this method would answer, but as it happens otherwise and that the Country comprehends many thousand miles in circuit this method would create a most prodigious heavy Government Expence. 2^{ly}, It is said that by the Treaty of Easton,^a made with the Indians during the War, all the Lands West of the Alleghany are given up to the Indians for hunting grounds, therefore good faith requires that they sho^d not be molested in the quiet possession of them. In answer to this objection it may be urged that the Treaty was made with the Northern Indians and therefore could only mean to affect those commonly used by them as hunting grounds. That therefore the Lands solicited by this Company must be out of the question, as it is far South, at least 600 miles from the Indians who were then treated with and where they never go to hunt. And also that by the common principles of reason and the Law of Nations that Treaty is vacated by the Indians themselves, who for the slightest causes have attacked his Majestie's fortifications and most barbarously

^a This treaty was negotiated in 1758 between the colony of Pennsylvania and the Indians; in it the former promised to make no settlements west of the Alleghanies. See *Canadian Archives Report*, 1889, pp. 72 ff.; *Documentary History of New York*, II. 775, 783. For the significance of the treaty see Alvord, *Genesis of the Proclamation of 1763*, pp. 13-14.

murdered in cold blood the King's Officers and Troops, that they have also invaded most of the Colonies East of Alleghany, murdering multitudes of his Majestie's Subjects, and destroying the Country before them with fire and Sword. This Insult on his Majestie's Government and their first violation of the Treaty now puts it in the Power of the Crown consistently with Justice, to pursue the political plan of getting that Country settled as quickly as possible; we call it political, because the fertility of the Soil, the immense quantity of it, the fineness of the Climate and the Situation of Navigation, renders it one of the most proper Countrys in the World for the production of Hemp, of which commodity, so necessary to Britain, any quantity may there be produced. As well as a variety of other crude materials for manufactures, which at present we purchase from foreigners at a very great expence; such as Silk, Iron, Indigo, etc. But above all things, Hemp, it appears peculiarly adapted to, because that plant so greatly and quickly impoverishes ground, that to make it in many quantities, not only a Soil uncommonly fertile is requisite, but there must be a prodigious quantity, also the good policy of this measure, will further appear from considering how effectually a strong Colony settled at that place proposed by the Company will contribute to prevent any encroachments the French Settlers on the west side of the Mississippi may be disposed to make on the King's Territorys in that part, and how they will be cutt off from all communication with the Indian Nations, and thereby be prevented from instigating them to War, and harassing the frontier Counties as they have constantly done of all the Colonies. It is to be considered likewise that as the French have already a very powerful Settlement upon the River Illinois and many Settlements among the Lakes and as by the Treaty of Peace they are to remain there as British Subjects; whether if our people are not allowed to settle beyond the Alleghanys, will not the above mentioned French be apt (under the security of the vast distance of 8 or 9 hundred miles from our Settlements) to invite over their Neighbors and Countrymen from the west side of the Mississippi, and thereby gradually take hold of that Country as to make another expensive War requisite to remove them. This is no improbable event, when we attend to the enterprizing and encroaching genius of the French, ever fond of invading their neighbor's rights when they can do it with any tolerable security. And that they will be permitted to do this unmolested by the Indians is extremely probable from the powerful influence they appear to have over the minds of these people by their behavior to these Settlers at the time they were besieging his Majesty's Fort at Detroit, the 11th of last May when they made use of the French as Mediators between them and the Garrison which French most dishonestly gave up the King's Officers they had engaged to protect, to the cruel fury of the Indians, no doubt the better to conciliate the affections of the Savages, and by the Summons they sent Major Gladwin wherein they call the French their Fathers. These facts make it certain whatever encroachments the French may be inclined to make, they will meet with no obstruction from the Indians. These are hints, Sir, that we have thought it prudent to mention to you, that if necessary, may be urged to the Ministry, but we doubt not but your reflections will furnish you with reasons of more weight than any we have here suggested.

We are also to observe to you, Sir, that Col. Mercer⁷ is now in

⁷ Colonel George Mercer.

London soliciting for the Ohio Company, and perhaps he may have under his protection the Interest of other Companies whose concerns may possibly interfere with ours, or that he may think so; and thereby be induced to oppose our Scheme; we request you not to converse with Col. Mercer on the subject of our solicitation, nor let him know that any such plan is projected. This letter together with our original Articles, the Memorial, and all our papers will be delivered you by Mr. Chas. Digges, a worthy member of the Company whose opinion in what results to the concerns of the Company we recommend to your attention; and if it should not be agreeable to you to be a member or to solicit our affairs, we advise you, and it is in our Opinion, that in the appointment of another agent, you consult Mr. Digges, and that you take his sentiments in the Choice of those nine members to be procured in Britain and in that event Mr. Digges will receive our papers and put them into the hands of another Solicitor. But nevertheless we hope your friendship for many members of the Company will induce you to favor their Scheme, and to assist Mr. Digges with your advice. We have nothing more at this time to observe to you, but only that you will be pleased from time to time to give us all necessary information and that you direct your letters for us to Mr. W^m Lee in Westmoreland County, Virginia; We are with great esteem, Sir, your most obedient and very humble Servants.

By order of the Committee, W^m LEE, *Secretary*.

Resolved, that the Treasurer take a fair Copy of the original Agreement, the Memorial, and the Letter together with the Resolves of the said Company made at Belleview^{*} Sept. 9, 1763, and deliver the same to Mr. Chas. Digges to be by him presented to Mr. Cumming.

Resolved that the Treasurer pay into the hands of Mr. Chas. Digges One hundred Guineas to be by him delivered to Mr. Cumming agreeable to the resolves of the Company.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY, VIRGINIA, March 1st, 1767.

Thos. Cumming, Esq.

Sir,

It was with concern we understand from your Letter to Mr. W^m Lee, dated the 16th of January, 1765, that little hope was to be entertained of success in a point so much wished by the Mississippi Company. But we should not so long have neglected to answer that very polite and obliging Letter if you had not in some measure rendered an answer unnecessary, by declaring your intention of resuming the Pen when such an alteration in American affairs should take place as might prove favorable to the Claim.

That the present is a proper Crisis to renew our solicitations, we hope as well from the wisdom of the Ministry, as from what you have been pleased lately to write Col. Thornton on this Subject. In conformity, therefore, with the direction of the Company at their last general meeting we are to request, that if in your opinion, a probability of success now opens immediate measures be taken to press for a determination by the Privy Council on the Company's Memorial; and as a previous prudent step we recommend the obtaining as quickly as possible, one half the number of British members of the Company, which you were desired

^{*} The residence of Colonel Thomas Ludwell Lee, in Stafford County, Virginia.

to procure by our former letter among which number, it will give us much pleasure that you sho^d. be one; but the other half it is deemed proper shall remain unfilled, till the next general meeting, when you will receive further advice on this head.

When the consideration of this affair is recommended we should be willing (as it appears to you proper), to yield that part of the Memorial relative to fortifications at Government expence, but with respect to the Quantity of Land for each Member, if it be rightly understood, an abridgement of that will by no means answer, since it remains a certainty that one third at least of the quantity will be necessarily sacrificed to the purpose of gaining a sufficient number of Settlers to secure the rest, which added to the Expence incurred by conveying people there, the greater number probably from the Continent of Europe, the charge of surveying, etc., will leave the remainder not more than a good encouragement to the adventure. With regard to the Crown, it would seem a much more probable method of securing and speedily increasing the quit Rent revenue, by placing the Land in the hands of persons of property, than by suffering things to remain as they are now, when people in numbers that have no property and of bad reputation generally are bursting daily thro' the bounds of the settled Colonies, and fixing on the Waters of the Ohio, both lawless and useless to their Country, a consciousness of having violated Government Orders making them choose to have as little communication with the interior parts as possible.

We observe your opinion of the settled Colonies being too thinly inhabited. For some purposes, no doubt it is so; but whilst Great Britain desires our application to Agriculture rather than to Arts her interest in this point will more effectually be obtained, by a dispersion than by a collection of our people; experience evincing, that when good land can be obtained on easy terms, the desire of manufacturing is almost entirely lost in the eagerness for tillage. The difficulty of procuring Land, and the complement of great numbers in small Tracts of Territory, call necessarily for the exercise of invention, from whence spring originally improvements in Arts and Manufactures.

As the spot chosen by the Company is open to navigation and the Country around extremely fertile, the settlers there will beyond doubt considerably benefit both themselves and the Mother Country from the Products of the Soil; so the means of conveying British fabricks by water must render them greatly cheaper than they can possibly be made there for ages at least.

The Company has been informed by Mr. Digges of your declining to accept the money formely tendered you; they regard this as a very uncommon, and a very noble instance of warm and disinterested friendship, the only return to which thay can at present make, is a real and genuine esteem.

We conclude that the Solicitor lodged the Memorial with the Privy Council and except the Ten Pounds paid him for that purpose, the Balance of the Money rests in the hands of Thos. Philpot, Esq., Merchant in London, who will be directed to pay it out to your Order as you shall find it necessary in the course of the solicitation.

In filling up the number of the British members as above mentioned we recommend your application to Flemming Pinkston, Esq., in St. Albans Street to be one of the Company.

We think of nothing more at this time necessary to be mentioned to you but our request that you give us (by means of Mr. W^m Lee) the most early notice of what is done in our business; and we beg leave to refer you to a due consideration of the Original Agreement and Memorial, and of our Letter accompanying them dated the 26th of Sept. 1763.

We remain with great regard, Sir, your most obedient and very humble Servants.

Signed after being agreed to by the Committee and by their Order,

WILLIAM LEE, *Secretary*.

At a General Meeting of the Mississippi Company at Stafford Court House in Virginia the 27th day of May 1767.

It appearing to the Company that the Committee in compliance with the directions of the said Company given to them at a meeting held the 22d day of Nov., 1765, have written to Mr. Cumming and pres'd him to solicit with vigor, the granting the Lands mentioned in the Memorial formerly sent to him, and the Letter being read to the Board which amongst other things directs that Mr. Cumming proceed to fill up the Subscriptions with only one half of the British members and the other half to remain 'till the next general meeting, which letter being approved of by the s^d: Company they have come to the following resolutions:

That as some Gentlemen of power, fortune and interest wo^d. willingly become members of our Company but may object to being limited to one Share.

Resolved that the Committee write Mr. Cumming to have regard to Major Thos. Addison's recommendations to him of such persons to whom a tender of two shares shall be made, and that the Treasurer write Major Addison requesting him to inform Mr. Cumming by Letter who the particular persons are to whom he may propose the acceptance of two Shares.

It appearing from experience, that a meeting of a Majority of the Members residing in Virginia and Maryland cannot be easily obtained according to the original Articles and an obstruction to business happening in consequence thereof, Resolved that for the future every general meeting of the Company shall be advertised in the Virginia and Maryland Gazette, and if at such a meeting a majority of the said members shall be assembled, four of which to be of the Committee, they shall have power to proceed on business and their determinations to be binding on the Company, anything to the contrary or seeming to the contrary thereof in the original articles notwithstanding.

Resolved that the Treasurer transmit a Copy of the last Resolve to every absent member in Virginia and Maryland that they may have notice thereof.

Resolved that as Mr. W^m Digges hath refused to pay his proportion of the Money as is directed by the Original Articles it is determined that Mr. Richard Graham on complying with the requisite payment, be admitted a member of the Company in place of the said Digges, and that the Treasurer inform Mr. Cumming of this alteration in the list of subscribers.

Ordered that the Treasurer forthwith demand of the Subscribers who have not paid their quotas agreeable to the Original Articles, the Sums of money respectively due from them.

Ordered that the Treasurer pay the Expences accru'd at this meeting out of the Money in his hands.

Agreed to by

Richard Henry Lee, William Brent, Francis Lightfoot Lee, William Fitzhugh, junr., Henry Fitzhugh, Francis Thornton, Thomas Ludwell Lee, Robert Brent, Richard Parker, Thomas Bullet, John Augustine Washington, W^m Beale, Junr., George Washington, W^m Booth, W^m Fitzhugh, John Riddell, Executor of the deceased James Douglas, Presly Thornton, W^m Flood, W^m Brokenbrough, Bened. Calvert, Henry Rozer, Anthony Stewart, the Rev. Henry Addison, Daniel Carroll.

Test, WILLIAM LEE, *Secretary*.

At a General Meeting of the Mississippi Company at Stafford Court House in Virginia, December 16th 1767.

Present

Richard Parker	Francis Thornton
Richard Henry Lee	William Brent
William Fitzhugh	John Augustine Washington
Francis Lightfoot Lee	William Fitzhugh, Junr.
Thomas Ludwell Lee	William Beale, Junr.
George Washington	William Lee

Richard Parker, Esq., chosen President of this meeting.

It is resolved that Messrs. Robt. Brent, Richard Graham, Philip Thomas Lee, William M^cGachin, and George Plater be excluded from the Company for not having paid their quota agreeable to the original Articles.

It is resolved that Mr. Edw. Key, dec'd, was not a member of this Company, having never signed the Original Articles.

It is resolved that Major Thomas Addison is not a member of this Company, but that application shall be made to him to become a member.

It is resolved that Mr. John Hite is not a member of this Company, having never signed the Articles or paid any money.

It is resolved that Mr. Samuel Washington be admitted as a member of this Company on complying with the Articles thereof.

It is resolved that Messrs. John Baylor, Bernard Moore and Thos. Walker be admitted as members of the Company on their complying with the Articles thereof.

It is resolved that Mr. Chas. Digges have full power and authority to sell or dispose of his share in this Company to Mr. Thos. Montgomery or any other person that the Company shall hereafter approve of.

It is resolved that application shall be made to Mr. Warner Lewis and Doctor Arthur Lee to become members of this Company.

It is the opinion of the Company and it is so ordered, that the Treasurer of the Company call a general meeting of the Company according to the rules of the Company for that purpose, on the 21st day of March next ensuing, and if at that time a number of members sufficient to form a general meeting shall not be assembled, that in that case the Committee already appointed by the Company or the Treasurer of the Company being so directed by the Committee, shall have full power and authority to demand and receive of each member of the Company the Sum of £13, 11, 0, Sterling, amounting in the whole to the Sum of £542 Sterling, which Sum the said Committee are empowered to dispose of in

employing an agent to proceed immediately to Britain, there to solicit the Company's Grant, as fully, speedily, and effectually as the nature of the Business will admit.

It is resolved that W^m Lee, Esq., the Treasurer, has presented his Account to the Company which is admitted.

It is resolved that W^m Lee Esq., be continued Treasurer to this Company.

It is resolved that the Treasurer pay the Expence of this meeting.

Test, WILLIAM LEE, *Secretary*.

LONDON, May 30, 1769.^o

Sir,

Above is a Copy of the Articles etc. of the Mississippi Co. which cost 11/ and 4/6 for the postage of your sundrie letters added to £13-11, your quota to the Mississippi Co. makes £14-6-6, for which Sum I have this day drawn on you at two days sight payable to Dr. Arthur Lee which I hope will meet with due honor. The temper of the present Ministry being much against America, it is tho't advisable to let the petition lay undetermined on, before the Board of Trade where it now is, in hopes a change of men (as is commonly the case), will bring also a change of measures. With regard to your Br. Robert's affairs in Virginia I am too little acquainted therewith to give you any authentic account thereof, but you may be much better informed by writing to Mr. John Ballantine Junr. mercht. on Nomony, Potomac, Virginia, or to Mr. David Boyd, Atty. at Law, Northumberland County, Virginia, either of these Gent. can give you a full acct. of his affairs. Capt. Gordon administered upon his estate and I believe has sold all the moveable estate, the lands were your Property and I don't see what occasion you had to sell them, but I suppose they were sold for your benefit. I wish it was in my power to give you more full information.

I am Yr most Hble Servt.

WILLIAM LEE.

2. A Projected Settlement of English-speaking Catholics from Maryland in Spanish Louisiana, 1767, 1768.

THE three documents printed below¹ form part of a correspondence relating to a proposed settlement in Spanish Louisiana by Maryland Catholics. Research in the Archivo de Indias has failed to

^o It does not appear to whom this letter was written. Its significance lies in its reference to the postponement due to the feeling of the ministry. For Lord Hillsborough's attitude, see the report of the Board of Trade in *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, VII. 19.

¹ All copied from originals in the Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Audiencia de Santo Domingo: Luisiana y Florida, Correspondencia Oficial con los Gobernadores, años 1751 á 1768, estante 86, cajón 6, legajo 6. The copies form part of a collection made for Mr. Louis Houck, of Cape Girardeau, Missouri, who has allowed use to be made of them here. The two English letters were evidently copied for Ulloa by a copyist unacquainted with English, and hence were poorly done. Mr. Houck's transcripts were carefully re-collated in Seville, thus proving that the original copies were faulty. Some of the most obvious errors have been corrected without comment, while in other cases the editorial bracket has been employed.

locate the other letters touching this matter (Jerningham's of May 2, 1767, and the reply of July 31) that are mentioned in the documents here presented, or to discover any other additional material regarding it.

The attempt to found a Catholic colony from Maryland in the midst of the French and Catholic colonists was never carried out. It was no new idea. Already in 1752, Charles Carroll had gone to France on a fruitless mission, to petition for a grant of land on the Arkansas River, in order that the oppressed Catholics of Maryland might settle there and have freer scope for the practice of their religion. After 1755, some of the Acadians who had been deported from their own country to Maryland found their way to Louisiana, where they were given lands, and where they received a hearty welcome from the French population. According to the letters presented here, bands of Acadians must have gone to Louisiana in 1766 or 1767. Their reception by the Catholic government may have inspired Jerningham's attempt. At any rate tentative efforts were made for the founding of a settlement by Catholics from Maryland, as outlined partially in Jerningham's two letters and the letter of Governor Antonio de Ulloa, the two former being enclosed by the latter to his home government.

But the time had gone by for such a colony. Had Carroll's negotiations in 1752 met with favor in France, doubtless many of the Catholics of Maryland would have sought an asylum under a Catholic government. Double taxes, and the various other oppressions, both economic and religious, and the intolerant spirit of the Protestant government, might easily have driven off some of the best families of the colony, and much wealth. After the treaty of 1763, however, conditions had almost insensibly been improving. There was a more tolerant spirit. Catholic worship was more freely permitted. There was less talk of persecution. Consequently, there was not the same reason for migration as before. The very tone of Jerningham's letters is indicative of the fact that the Catholics would migrate only if their conditions were met by the Spanish authorities. This in itself points to a larger tolerance of their worship in Maryland. The same independence would not have been expressed fifteen years earlier. The agitation was no longer principally on religious but on economic grounds.

The presence in Louisiana of a body of colonists, although Catholic, from the near-by English colonies, who expressed themselves so distinctly and independently, would later not have tended to ensure the Spanish authorities, who were so soon to be seized by

a veritable hysteria against all Americans. It is more than likely that most of those who might have migrated and their descendants would have favored, if they had not joined in, the movement that was inaugurated from above for the opening of the Mississippi; and with effect, for the families who proposed to migrate were for the most part industrious tradesmen and owners of property. The end of Louisiana must have been the same. There might have been a greater English-speaking Catholic body in certain districts. Otherwise, the course of history would have remained unchanged. The economic aspects would continually have assumed greater proportion at the expense of the purely religious, among a people independent by nature and training; and this would in time have dominated and controlled the political.

The attempt is more interesting, however, from its mere historic aspect than from the speculative side. It is illustrative of one phase of life in the colonies, Spanish as well as English. It shows also the tendency toward a break-down of the artificial barriers between the Latin and Anglo-Saxon centres in America. That the attempt failed was perhaps a gain to the American revolution against England that broke out eight years later.

For notices of the Catholics of Maryland during the period from about 1750 to 1771, see the *Maryland Gazette*; the correspondence of Governor Sharpe (1753-1771) in volumes VI., IX., and XI. of *Archives of Maryland*, published by the Maryland Historical Society; and J. G. Shea, *The Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-1892), volumes I. and II. In the archives of Georgetown University (no. 43, envelope 10) is a manuscript volume on the state of the Catholics in Maryland, in which is a petition (April 10, 1756) of the Maryland Catholics to the provincial Assembly, praying that no double or increased tax be laid on Catholics. See also the document on page 819 of volume XV. of this journal, where mention is made in 1784 of the prospect that, independence and tolerance being now assured, Catholics might extensively migrate from Maryland and the neighboring regions to those on the left bank of the Mississippi.

Definite notices regarding Henry Jerningham are scant. An old family tree in the possession of Mrs. H. Q. Slye, of Washington, D. C., shows that Henry Jernegan (an old form of the name), M. D., "embarked for Maryland, in America July 22". Inquiries addressed by the managing editor of this journal to Lord Stafford of Costessey Hall, the present head of the Jerningham family, and to Stafford Henry Jerningham, esq., of the same residence, and

pursued through the aid of Dr. Marcus W. Jernegan of the University of Chicago, elicited some information. Mr. Jerningham writes: "I have . . . carefully waded through six boxes of documents in our Muniment Room here and I regret to say that I cannot come across anything which would throw a light on the matter. I see that this Henry Jerningham was the grandson of Sir Francis Jerningham, third baronet of Costessey. He died in the Province of Maryland on November 20, 1772, leaving two sons and five daughters." A pen-and-ink sketch of his family, sent over from Maryland by him, is preserved at Costessey. Several advertisements inserted in the *Maryland Gazette* make it evident that Jerningham had a private hospital in connection with his medical practice. The issues of February 10, March 20, and September 26, 1771, contain notices in regard to vaccination against smallpox, his prices for that service, and the number treated at his house. His original will is owned by Mrs. Jessie Thomson, of St. Louis, and copies of it are in the possession of Mrs. H. Q. Slye. It bears date November 19, 1772, and was witnessed by Eleanor Lancaster, George Slye, and Ignatus Craycroft. In this document the names of his five daughters are given as Frances Henrietta, Mary, Helloisa, Edwardinna, and Olivia; and those of his sons, Charles and Henry Tobias. A notice in the *Maryland Gazette*, September 9, 1773, signed by his wife Catherine and his daughter Frances, offers for sale the medical possessions left by Jerningham, various articles of furniture, etc. Jerningham appears to have been a man of considerable wealth and influence in his district.

The family connections alluded to in the postscript to the first letter can be readily made out, and the claims made confirmed. One learns from Playfair, *British Family Antiquity* (London, 1811), VI. 184, 185, that Sir Francis Jerningham (1650-1730), third baronet, married Ann Blount, aunt of Mary Blount, duchess of Norfolk; that his second son was Sir George Jerningham, fifth baronet, whose elder son, afterward Sir William, was married in June, 1767, to the daughter of Viscount Dillon, while his younger son, Charles, became a general officer in the service of the King of France; that Henry Jerningham, fourth son of Sir Francis, had five sons and three daughters; that the second of these sons, Henry, married and settled in America, had two sons and five daughters, and died in Maryland November 20, 1772; that the third son, Charles, became a general officer in the service of the Emperor and died at Vienna in 1802 at the age of 80; that the fifth son, Hugh, was a religious at Douay till 1793 when he died at Dover while returning to England

after the expulsion of the Franciscans from Douay; that the three daughters, Mary, Elizabeth, and Edwardina, were religious in the English Augustinian monastery at Bruges until 1794. The Jerningham and Dillon families, between whom marriage was not uncommon, were among the most famous of Catholic families in England and Ireland. Much of the correspondence of Frances Dillon (d. 1825), wife of Sir William Jerningham, was published in the *Jerningham Letters* (London, 1896), edited by Egerton Castle. An old pamphlet is conserved among the Jerningham papers entitled *Particulars illustrative of the Genealogy of Jerningham, or Jernegan, compiled from the Antient Family and other Records*.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

I. DR. HENRY JERNINGHAM TO DON ANTONIO DE ULLOA.²

MARYLAND North America Mouth of Wicomico river
ST MARYS COUNTY Novem 28 1767.³

Excellent Sir.

I have inclosed to your Excellency a faithfull Copy of a letter dated New Orleans July 31, 1767. it having no nominal or manual signatur[e] Credit could not be given to it here; besides it hints only at the questions pointed at. permit me to request an answer more explicit. grant me also the favor of your pardon, if I undertake to acquaint you, that a British subject is free, that he may emigrate Where he pleases, in time of peace, nothing Can Stop him but his Creditors, Should he have any. your Court and governors of his Catholic Majesty, need be under no apprehensions, of Kindling any Jealousy in the Breast of the British Ministry on that account, because a Clearance from the officer of the port where the adventurers Would ship themselves as migrators is not only a passport and permission, but a positive assent of his Britannic Majesty ratified by his officer affixing his seal to it. the Letter of the 31 July says, lands are granted in property Without fee, or futur[e] taxation. it does not inform What is the lot of individuals, or What people of property, may purchase or What price. Was this certyfyed With the other proposed of the 2d May many Who are the descendants of pure noble and ancient Blood Would Settle among you. Objection: unless we have his most Catholic Majestys royal assurance of Irish or English priests the Migrants could not comply With the dutys incumbent of a Roman Catholic, nor have any spiritual consolation at the hour of death. this the letter Says his Catholic Majesty shall be incessantly consulted on; all that would enter to plant there familys among you could not have objection to taking the oath of allegiance to his Catholic Majesty, as their intention it Would be to become his subjects; in consequence, must conform to all the Laws and customs as every good Citizen Should doe Where he resides. None of the roman Catholics of

² Antonio de Ulloa, the first Spanish governor of Louisiana, arrived in Louisiana, March 5, 1766, and was expelled from the colony by the French citizens, November 1, 1768. See an account of his term of government in Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, II.

³ The original from which this transcript is made reads incorrectly, "1768".

this province have never betrothed there allegiance. Nor it never has been demanded of them by his Britannic Majesty. the fertility of your Soil and healthiness of the Climate are well Known from history, and converse With those Who have travelled and resided there. We have seen many letters from the Acadians to their Countrymen, pressing them to speed themselves to partake of their good fortune in that fruitfull region. as they could not have been a Sufficient time in the Country, to render an account of it, and in general, but illiterate people not great confidence could be reposed in their relations; in many essential particulars they are very much Wanting. first how they are served or the natives in the Country, With priest or Missionars;⁴ New Orleans, we Know, does not Want them. are the seculars or What religious orders are among you. we Know, since his Catholic Majestys late orders no jesuits reside in his Extensive dominions. your Excellency, May be assured, there are hundreds of roman Catholic families here, to whom the advantages granted to the Acadiens Who are gone among you Would be a great blessing to them; but men of property and fortunes must Know before they dispose of their estates here on What terms they can acquire an equivalent among you w^{ch} is not to be attained to by any other method, we can devise, than by your Excellencys information, so as to leave no further doubts among Us. you can not Expect, on such a treaty, any person to appear authorised With a public Carachter because it relates solely to the roman Catholics, Who Can not represent or serve, in any office under the British government. secondly tho the constitution does not impede his Subjects from migrating to any part of the globe Sound policy dictates to her as to all other nations, to encourage an encrease rather than decrease of their inhabitants.

I am your Excellencys most humble and obedient Servant,

HENRY JERNINGHAM, *m Doctor and Eques Anglicanus.*

P. S.

Your Subscribers father Was first Cousin of the present dutchess of Norfolk the 1st dutchess in Britain.

I am related to many of the prime nobility, roman Catholic in England—

My Eldest Brother died a Jesuit at Rome.

My younger Brother Charles is now Lieutenant Colonel in Regiment de Stampech Cuirassiers pour le service de son imp. Ré d'hongrie.

Hugo still younger a recollect at douay in french flanders.

three Sisters ann Elizabeth and Edwardina now living all religious at the augustins' nuns at bruges, in the Austrians netherlands.

My uncle Sir george Jerningham Knight and Baronet now Living, was in a public Carachter at the Court of Charles 12. King of Suede. his son lately married my lord dillons daughter and his youngest son is a lieutenant Colonel in the service of his C[h]ristian Majesty.

I have a wife and seven Children.

II. JERNINGHAM TO ULLOA.

May it please your Excellency.

Sir:

If I presume to trouble you since my answer, to your 31 of July dated New Orleans 1767, it is to acquaint your Excellency that the

⁴ That is, by members of any religious order.

bearer James Walker, is sent by his neighbours, to your Excellency to receive your information relating to the subject I have been Writing to you about in my letter of the 2d may 67, and nov. the same year, also in his own name, and that of his neighbours, begs your Excellencys permission to travel in the Country, and assistance of passports necessary therefore, that he may be able thereby to get information, and intelligence of the soil and Civil government in order at his return to satisfy his friends and neighbours, Who are desirous to settle among you. this same James Walker is a plebeyan and mechanic. his father and mother were Roman Catholics, and dyed in that faith. he was Christened in the same communion and has behaved as a good C[h]ristian, and moral man, With the Esteem of his neighbours, and those Who are acquainted With him; he possess[es] lands in freehold here, nor has he any other Views or intentions in his Expedition, but to enable himself at his return to render agreeable accounts to his friends, relations, and neighbours, that may encourage them to undertake the same voyage With their familys. he proposes With your Excellencys permission to remain some months, under your governmant, to see the produce of the soil, at the different seasons, the manners and Customs of the people, their Way of living, and how the Laws are executed, Questions every reasonable and thinking person Will be enquisitive about at his return.

I am your Excellencys most obedient and humble servant.

HENRY JERNINGHAM. *m. D et eques Anglicanus.*

December 14th 1767.

III. ULLOA TO THE MARQUIS OF GRIMALDI.⁵

NUEVO ORLEANS II. de Febrero de 1768.

Don Antonio de Ulloa.

Noticias de los Catholicos de Mariland que quieren venirse á la Colonia.

Número 2.

Excelentísimo Señor.

Mui Señor mio: Los Catolicos de Marilanda aviendo recibido la respuesta anonima que les hize en 31 de Julio último: de que remiti copia á Vuestra Excelencia an buolto á escribirme con los Acadianos recien llegados:⁶ y por las copias de las dos cartas que hé recibido de ellos y paso á Vuestra Excelencia se impondrá ampliamente en los terminos en que lo hácen: siendo signa[da]s, de que las haga reconocer.

Tambien verá Vuestra Excelencia que an embiado un sujeto de su confianza, de los mismos que pretenden venir á establecerse, para que se imponga en las circunstancias y seguridades que desean tener, como asi

⁵ Minister of State.

⁶ "Have again written me through the recently arrived Acadians." From January 1 to May 13, 1765, about 650 Acadians arrived at New Orleans and were sent to form the settlements of Attakapas and Opelousas. In February, 1766, another band of 216 arrived in Louisiana and were authorized to settle along both sides of the Mississippi, from the German Coast as far as Baton Rouge, and even as high as Pointe Coupée. Acadians had, however, been sent to Maryland as early as 1755 and 1756, and it was through some of these who migrated to Louisiana that Jerningham entered into communication with Ulloa. See Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, II. 122, 132; and J. T. Scharf, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879), pp. 473-479. See also Professor Alcée Fortier's article on the Acadians of Louisiana in his *Louisiana Studies* (New Orleans, 1894), pp. 148-197.

mismo en la disposicion de las Tierras, y proporciones de ellas para venir las á Poblar, abandonando alla sus poseciones y combeniencias que tienen.

Como este asunto toma ya alguna formalidad: y para condesender en el reconocimiento del Pais que há de hacer el Emisario se necesita alguna seguridad: hé tomado Ynformes de los mismos Acadianos: quienes sin discrepancia me confirman quanto dice la carta: esplicando que estas familias catholicas son las que fueron espulsadas de Ynglaterra en los tiempos de los alborotos de aquel Reyno sobre religion y en los posteriores á el: que conserbandose desde entonces en la Catholica en toda pureza, se hallan oprimidos y despreciados por el Dominio de los Protestantes: y que informados de lo bien recibido que há sido los Acadianos, y de estar bien hallados: sean propuesto mudar de domicilio sacrificando por la livertad en el uso de Religión, y estimacion de sus personas, los vienes raises que poseen alli.

Con esta seguridad hé dispuesto que el Emisario Jacobo Walker pase con los mismos Acadianos hasta San Luis,⁷ reconociendo las Poblaciones de los venidos en los dos años pasados, y con particularidad el desaogo y descanso conque se hallan ya los del mes de Julio último.

He dispuesto también que desde San Luis los conduzga una Barca por el Rio Colorado⁸ 5 ó 6 jornadas á dentro, hasta el Rio de Cañas⁹ para que vea la extensión de tierras con sus buenas proporciones: y bolbiendo á salir al Misisipy, lo lleven por el Estero de Chafalalla¹⁰ á los Opelusas, donde vera otra Población bastante pingue de Acadianos, territorios bién extendidos y Prados donde se pierde la vista. Todo ello bá esplicado mas difusamente en las dos Ynstrucciones de que también remito copias á Vuestra Excelencia.

En esta forma será carta viva este sujeto en quién sus compatriotas hán puesto la confianza, y tendré poco que escribir para responderles á la suya remitiendome á los informes que el les hará.

Puede Vuestra Excelencia considerar que por este medio, si les quadra el Pais, bá de repente á Poblarse la Colonia populosamente con una especie de gente enemiga y [ir]reconciliable á la Ynglesa, por el desprecio y persecución en que les hán tenido; y que tanto quanto el Rey adquiriera Vasallos se disminuie los de la Ynglaterra, persuadiendome á que será un torrente de Pobladores el que acudirá aqui en poco tiempo, si empiesan á benir dejando tanto bacio como el que aqui llenaren, en el Pais que abandonan: pues si Marilanda ofrece muchas mas de mil familias quantas serán las que darán las otras Provincias contiguas, al exemplo de las primeras: De lo que resultará de este reconocimiento avisaré á Vuestra Excelencia en primera ocasion.

Nada ay ya que hacer en esta matheria más que dejarlas venir, si se determinan á ello; pues si sucediere que llegue el sucesor que deseo, y hé suplicado á Vuestra Excelencia, quedará impuesto en los parages y

⁷ This, of course, is the trading post of St. Louis des Illinois, the modern St. Louis, which had been founded only a few years before.

⁸ The Red River of Louisiana.

⁹ There is a Cane River on some of the old maps of Louisiana, in the old Opelousas district, but it flows southward into the Gulf of Mexico. This is evidently the Spanish name of one of the rivers that unites with the Red River at some little distance from the Mississippi—perhaps the Black or Ouachita.

¹⁰ The Atchafalaya Bayou, the most northern of the mouths of the Mississippi, which has at times threatened to divert the water from the main part of the river.

modo como deve colocarlos que sean útiles á S. M. y al acresentamiento de la Colonia, y en el de manejarse para lo subsesibo sobre el mismo asunto; sin que de ello se siga ninguna mala resulta con la Corte de Ynglaterra: Yo propio dejare escrito antes de ausentarme á aquellos Catholicos; afiansandoles en la confianza que devan tener con el sugeto que governare aqui; y les daré conducto para que me escriban á España en caso de que lo necesiten. Esto digo á Vuestra Excelencia para que no tenga desconfianza de que se malogre lo adelantado estribando solo en que se sigan las sendas que quedan ya trilladas.

Ofresco mi obediencia [á] las ordenes de Vuestra Excelencia con la más rendida voluntad y ruego á Dios le guarde la vida muchos años que deseo.

NUEBO ORLEANS y Febrero 11 de 1768.

Excelentísimo Señor,

Beso la Mano de Vuestra Excelencia
su mas seguro y fido servidor,

D. ANTONIO DE ULLOA (*rubric*).

[Addressed: "Excelentísimo Señor Marques de Grimaldi".]

3. *Letters of William T. Barry, 1806-1810, 1829-1831.*

For the following letters and extracts from letters we are indebted to Professor Isaac J. Cox. They are derived from a book of copies of letters of William T. Barry, Postmaster-General under Jackson, 1829-1835, now in the possession of Mrs. Walton C. Hill, of Newport, Kentucky. The first two were addressed to his oldest brother, John Barry. The third is an autobiographical fragment in a letter ostensibly addressed to his infant son. The remainder were written to his daughter, Mrs. Susan Taylor of Newport, Kentucky.

Barry was born in Virginia in 1785, was graduated from the College of William and Mary in 1807, represented Kentucky in the House of Representatives in 1810-1811 and in the Senate in 1815-1816, and held high judicial office in his state. When appointed Postmaster-General in March, 1829, he had lately been defeated as Jackson candidate for governor of Kentucky. It is familiar that he was the first Postmaster-General to be admitted to a seat in the Cabinet. Resigning in 1835 to become minister to Spain, after an unsuccessful administration of the Post-Office Department, he died on his way to that country. His letters, mostly occupied with family matters, reveal an affectionate nature, expressing itself conventionally but warmly, an anxious desire to improve by self-education, and a mind of but ordinary capacity. The letters and extracts selected for publication, while they contain nothing of importance that is wholly new, cast an interesting light on two important political episodes. During the last part of his public service Barry felt considerably embittered against those who surrounded Jackson and,

as he thought, used the latter for selfish purposes; but he retained still a great admiration for his hero.

I. WILLIAM T. BARRY TO JOHN BARRY.

LEXINGTON, December 6th, 1806.

Dear Brother:

I have received yours of the 19th Ultimo, written in Pittsburg. Its contents astonished me much, but I was not surprised to find that S.¹ is the confidential friend of B. . . .²

He is a young man of striking character. His passage thro' life has been marked with uncommon incidents. I felt a great regard for him, and feel glad he went off, least he should have gained too much on me. But give my compliments to him if you see him. We differ in our political views, but I regard him as a man of honour and a gentleman. The times appear big with events. B. . . . and his party are worthy of much attention. They ought to be watched. The Executive of the U. S. must be greatly embarrassed. Tom's Philosophy will not do in these calamitous times; as Randolph observed, it is necessary to have a little energy. J. Davis³ has renewed the prosecution against B. . . .; how it will terminate I can't say.

He has also indicted Genl. Adair for the same or a similar offense. A few days will ascertain the result. Sebastian is completely disgraced. It is proven incontestably that he has for some years received a Pension of \$2000 per annum. The Legislature is in a great ferment and talk of unmaking two more of the Judges of the Court of Appeals, viz., Muter and Wallace; if they do not resign, I conjecture they will be removed. Thos. Todd, one of their brother Judges, is anxious now for their removal, and says that in consequence of their imbecility all the duties of the court devolve on him. The confession of Judge Innis, who was called on as a witness against Sebastian, has astonished the country and established beyond doubt the existence of a former Spanish Association. When he produced the evidences of it, it was done with much reluctance; he cried like a child, was attacked with a Vertigo that night, and was under the necessity of being bled twice. Thus it is that weak men, innocently inclined, when entrapped by the arts of the ingenious and intriguing, feel ashamed and abashed at the development of their own folly. Like a pendulum, oscillating from virtue to vice, one half of his life spent in sinning and the other in repentance. The enemies to the N. World⁴ literally know not what to do or say. Wm. Little⁵ has just completed a pamphlet of more than a hundred pages, in order to prove that no Spanish Association was ever formed. Its object was to exculpate John Brown and Sebastian, etc. The very evening it came from the press in Frankfort, Sebastian gave the lie to it, by a full and open confession. This at a single blow overturned the fine fabric of the Apostle's missionary construction. Old Bradford,⁶ etc., had spoken

¹ Perhaps Senator John Smith of Ohio.

² Burr. The letter was written the day after the grand jury at Frankfort discharged Burr.

³ Joseph H. Daveiss, the Federalist district attorney.

⁴ *New World*, meaning the *Western World*, Wood and Street's newspaper.

⁵ William Littell, *Political Transactions in and concerning Kentucky* (Frankfort, 1806).

⁶ John Bradford of the *Kentucke Gazette*.

highly of this work of Little's, and recommended it to many of his acquaintances as a work of merit, and one calculated to correct the mistaken notions produced by the falsehoods of the New World. But now he looks like the solemn Owl and says nothing; he does not even make a noise after night. I am anxious to hear from you again and hope it will not be long before I have that pleasure. Inform me when you expect to return. We have cold weather here and a deep snow on the ground.

Your affectionate Brother,

W. T. BARRY.

To Doctor John Barry from Kentucky, Philadelphia.

II. W. T. BARRY TO JOHN BARRY.

LEXINGTON, KY., January 2nd, 1807.

Dear Brother.

Yours of the 1st and 10th Ult. came together by this day's mail. I feel much indebted for the important information they contain. I was only surprised at one thing, and that is that the British Government and B. . . . should be co-operating. I would rather conjecture that it is the Spanish and French Govts., from the conduct of the Ministers of those Countries resident in the U. S. The Marquis of Irugo⁷ is certainly friendly to the views of B. . . ., and if B's plans are against the Spanish provinces, Irugo is betraying the cause of his Sovereign. Another thing, why do not the French and Spanish Ministers remonstrate with our government against the machinations forming to injure their provinces? I am informed the British Minister disclaims any connection with the party and has informed the Secretary of State, Mr. Madison, that the existing conspiracy has its origin in New Orleans. This is certain, and detailed to me by an agent of the U. S. There is great noise here; people are cursing B. . . . and all his adherents. The would-be Lexington Franklin, alias Bradford, has publicly declared that B. . . . is the greatest rascal in the world; that his opinions are entirely changed with regard to him. But this change is easily accounted for; times have been eventful since you left this. In a former letter I mentioned the election of Pope,⁸ the resignation of Adair,⁹ and the election of Clay in his stead. Bibb was elected to fill Clay's place in the State Legislature. The sickness of his family caused him to resign very soon. I was elected in his place, and continue a member yet. The Session closed last Saturday; we were in conclave two or three days, and had many of B's plans disclosed. Mr. Graham, Secretary of N. Orleans, had just arrived from Washington. He bears a Commission from the President of the U. S. authorizing him to enquire into the traitorous plans that are formed, and to arrest offenders against the laws. He detailed to us all he knows, which is too tedious to mention in full. He says, the first object is an attack on N. Orleans to get possession of the publick treasure which is upwards of two million, arms, etc.; to keep possession of that place; to revolutionize the Spanish provinces and establish an independent Govt. distinct from the U. S. and ultimately to bring about a separation of the Union. This information has come from

⁷ Irujo.

⁸ John Pope, elected senator from Kentucky for the term 1807-1813.

⁹ From the United States Senate. Henry Clay, elected in his place, sat from December 29, 1806, to March 4, 1807.

AM. HIST. REV. VOL. XVI.—22.

Blannerhasset, thro' a gentleman who he tried to seduce from his country. Mr. Graham has Blannerhasset's letters to this gentlemen offering him a Commission if he would join. Graham conversed with Blannerhasset himself and understood from him enough to satisfy him that a plan as above mentioned, was formed. Everybody is now convinced that B. . . . is a traitor. The Secretary of War, Dearborne, has written to the Governor of this State, directing him to order out the Militia to the amount of 200 or 300 men, which has been done. Some are stationed at Newport, opposite Cincinnati; some at Louisville, and some at the mouth of the Ohio, to stop the boats of B. that attempt to descend. The Legislature of this State passed a law authorizing the arrest of persons who are engaged in the project. The State of Ohio passed a similar law and the Militia in that State are ordered out. Wilkinson's Army have gone with him at their head, to N. Orleans. This movement is unaccountable, and it is supposed to be unauthorized by Govt; if so, a blow is struck at N. Orleans e'er this. B. . . . left this more than three weeks ago. He is said to have gone from here to Genl. Jackson's in two days; he travels night and day. Genl. Adair has followed him. George Adams followed him to Nashville, and will, I suppose, go down the river. Everything is in commotion here. You mention Martin D. Hardin's being in Philadelphia; he is said to be an agent of Genl. Adair's; his departure from this State was sudden and unexpected. It is the general opinion that Adair is in the project. There is no doubt that Genl. J. of Tennessee¹⁰ is; he is to furnish 500 men. 80 men have been enlisted for B. near Vincennes. Blannerhasset descended the river about three weeks since. Part of his boats were stopped; he had to run off and leave his wife at Marietta. Comfort Tyler, it is said, has passed Cincinnati in the night and gone on down the river. A great many young men have descended the river; but if any are behind, they will be stopped if they attempt to go down now. B. . . . sold bills of exchange in this place to the amt. of \$42,000, and it is expected they will all be protested; if so, it will ruin some of the Merchants here. I shall be sorry for some, but for others I am not. Sanders purchased \$15,000, Craig \$4,000, Anderson \$5,000, and others the balance. The prospect of losing money has touched the Merchants in a tender place. Their country may go to ruin, and they will sit calm in their counting houses, but touch the strong box, and they are aroused immediately. It pleases me to think that the servile, syncophantic, parasites of B. are now paying for the honour of his acquaintance. They have submitted to be trampled on, and then pay the man who has abused them, like the servile spaniel, who licks the foot that kicks him. I could say much more but have not room in a letter. I expect to see you soon, when we can talk this matter over. My part in the great Tragedy about to be performed is pointed out by the finger of virtue and patriotism. I will sacrifice all that is dear to me, before I will injure my country.

Lucy sends her love to you. Our friends are well.

Your affectionate Brother,

W. T. BARRY.

To Dr. John Barry, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

¹⁰ Andrew Jackson.

III. W. T. BARRY TO HIS INFANT SON.

October 2nd, 1810.

... I was born in the County of Lunenburg, Virginia, of honest Parents, obscure and humble in life; with property enough to make independent and place them far above the reach of want, but not enough to bring them in the most distinguished circles.

I was the youngest of four children, three brothers and a sister. My father, altho' not a man of education himself, was impressed with its importance and resolved to give his children as good an education as his circumstances would admit of. After going to an English school, my oldest Brother was sent to an Academy in N. Carolina, where he made rapid progress in his studies and was distinguished above his fellows for quickness of parts; after completing a College Education he studied Physic and entered upon the practice, as I shall hereafter have occasion to mention. My second Brother and myself were at school together; we were constant companions in all our engagements and amusements. We went to the Latin School and commenced the study of that Language; together we learnt the grammar. The school broke up. He went to keep store with a country merchant, I remained at an English school. He afterwards went to keep an Apothecary Shop in Petersburg.

In the year '96, when I was about 13 years old, my Father removed with his family to Kentucky and settled about 7 miles from Lexington. My eldest Brother still continued to study Physic. My Brother Leonard and myself were sent to the Kentucky Academy in Woodford.

IV. W. T. BARRY TO MRS. SUSAN TAYLOR.

WASHINGTON, 16th May, 1829.

My dear Daughter,

I am happy to hear by your letter of the 3rd of the good health of your family and our friends at Belle Vue.

Yesterday's mail brought me a letter from my dear John.

He writes in good spirits and says his health is much improved. He made a good impression here, especially on the mind of the Secretary of War.¹¹ I find that slander has gone abroad against the amiable lady of this gentleman. I was not acquainted with her until I came to the City.¹² She appears to be an artless, sincere and friendly woman. She may have been imprudent, as most of the ladies here are, but I cannot believe she was ever criminal. Major Eaton is himself, one of the most estimable men I ever saw; he is the confidential friend of the President, and has quite as much, rather more, weight with him than any other member of the Cabinet. The truth is, there is an aristocracy here, as there is in all places, claiming preference for birth or wealth, and demanding obeisance from others, they allow none but sycophants who cringe to them to have standing or character. Mrs. Eaton was the daughter of a Tavern-keeper belonging to the democracy, she has by good fortune (if it may be so considered) moved into the fashionable world. This has touched the pride of the selfconstituted great, awakened the jealousy of the malignant and envious, and led to the basest calumny.

¹¹ John H. Eaton.

¹² But in a letter to his wife, February 24, 1815, Barry mentions as one of the *agrément*s of his boarding house "a charming little girl, the daughter of Mr. O'Neal, who very frequently plays on the piano and entertains us with agreeable songs". Presumably this was the future Mrs. Eaton.

You must receive with caution what comes through the family of Judge. . . . He wanted to be Secretary of War; Eaton was preferred to him and he is a disappointed man. Selfish and ambitious, he has thought of himself more than of his friends or *country*. His character was known and he was not wanted in the Cabinet. This, of course, is confidential. But it is true. The President and his family (a most interesting and amiable one) are on terms of intimacy and friendship with Major Eaton and his, so are the other heads of Department. As to myself, I am now living in Major Eaton's family. I remained some weeks at Gadsby's Hotel, but as soon as Major Eaton commenced housekeeping he offered me a room with such sincere evidence of friendship and regard that I could not decline it. His servants, carriage and horses, are all at my command. He has treated me like a brother; offers me his name in making any pecuniary arrangements I desire, and does everything to make me comfortable. Both he and Mrs. Eaton treated our dear John with marked attention and kindness whilst he was in the City, and it is no small matter for a Cadet to have the good will of the Secretary of War. I have been thus particular because of the calumny that is abroad. If rumor were to be credited, but few handsome ladies in the fashionable world in the City would be free from blemish. The world is bad enough; helpless women are exposed to innumerable dangers; they often err, but men are most to blame, and the Slanderer, above all characters, I most detest.

I have been much occupied with my public duties. They are becoming more familiar to me, and I shall get along very well with my friends; the approbation of my enemies I do not calculate on. In appointments I am cautious; the government here are often deceived and, of course, make some bad selections. But where abuses have been practiced, *changes* are and ought to be made; it is not done in other cases. Your Post Master at New Port, and all others like him who have acted well, are safe. But those who have abused their privileges, circulated *Coffin* hand bills, abused Mrs. Jackson, and acted partially in their stations, ought not to expect to remain in office. It should be recollected that offices are not private property; they belong to the public; those held at the will of the President, ought to expect to go out when they lose his confidence. In my station I lay aside personal feelings, unless duty comports with their gratification. It would have afforded me pleasure to have appointed Mrs. Taylor's brother to the P. Office at Maysville, but the views of the President were, of course, controlled by the wishes expressed of the people of Ky. and especially of the members of the Legislature in favour of Mr. Marshall. I have made changes at Frankfort and Louisville against my feelings, but policy called for them; indeed, justice to the administration required it. Mr. Clay is at Work; his partisans who have abused their stations and who are still devoted to his interests cannot or ought not to remain in office.

It is quite probable that by the time you get this letter your Mama will be with you. Request her to travel slow and not fatigue herself or the children. I have made arrangements for them on from Wheeling, and will, if I can, meet them on the road. She will come in handsome style, comfortable, free from expense (save Tavern bills, etc.), and with kind and marked attention everywhere. I have invited your Uncle John W. Overton to come on. General Jackson says he shall have employment here. It is probable I shall find a place for him in my Department.

I shall doubtless call frequently on Mr. Taylor to aid me in my business in Ky. and Ohio. I hope fondly and shall expect from you and him a visit, after we are fixed here.

Kiss your dear little ones for me, and present me kindly to Mr. Taylor and all the rest of my friends that are of the family.

Your affectionate Father,

W. T. BARRY.

V. BARRY TO MRS. TAYLOR.

[WASHINGTON, June 11, 1829.]

Developments are constantly making here, of frauds and peculations upon the public treasury, practiced in the late administration, that will justify removals and awaken public indignation. It cannot be expected of any administration, to keep near them in offices of high trust and confidence, personal or political enemies. Removals awaken sympathy that is momentary and passes off, whilst the silent but constant influence of official station and power is continually operating.

It is not necessary to act from a spirit of vengeance in punishing enemies, but it is right and politic to encourage and reward friends; it tends to animate, whilst the opposite course would discourage and distress them. Besides it is no punishment to restore men to all the rights of citizens. Public employments must necessarily and ought to be upon the principle of rotation in office. The sentiment of monarchy is growing rapidly; men and their friends cling to office and lay claims to it as private property, and cry out robbery if they are turned out. These men that complain so loudly thought it no robbery, nor did I, to turn the new Court Judges out of office.¹³ If Adams had succeeded, what would have become of the friends of Jackson? This question should be answered. Do we turn out men that the Democratic party wish retained? Are the real friends of General Jackson and his administration displeased; would they rather have enemies than friends in office?

If the great body of public officers are to be retained, why change the head of the nation. Those who prefer the calm of perpetuity in office, would certainly be better pleased that the Executive head be made permanent. This will not suit a republic; it was not the case in Greece or in Rome. Republics are necessarily agitated and excited; when they cease to be so, the calm ends in monarchy and despotism. But I have not time for further speculation. Show this letter to my friends, Col. Tibbatts and Mr. Taylor, as I have so little time to write one letter must do for all, and as I have began to answer you, have concluded to write a little to them. . . .

VI. BARRY TO MRS. TAYLOR.

[WASHINGTON, June 25, 1829.]

How uncertain are the pleasures of this world. Your Mama, who has seen so much trouble, had brightened up with new prospects of happiness. Day before yesterday we were to have dined with the British Minister, yesterday with the President, but, alas, we have been

¹³As to Old Court and New Court (of Appeal), see Sumner's *Jackson*, pp. 127, 133. Barry had been chief justice of the New Court, abolished at the end of 1826.

at the bedside of our dear child. And Mrs. E. . . . (this much slandered lady)¹⁴ declining the invitations to dinner, has had poor Leonard in her arms day and night without sleeping, nursing him as tenderly as her own child. General Jackson is remarkably kind. He quit his company at an early hour after dinner, came to our lodgings, sat by our dear babe for two or three hours, encouraging us and animating the Doctors to persevere in their remedies. We have strong hopes, but are preparing for the worst. . . .

VII. BARRY TO MRS. TAYLOR.

WASHINGTON, 25th February, 1830.

My dear Daughter,

I have received yours and the one enclosed to your dear Brother John, which is forwarded by today's mail.

We are all well at home, and dear Armistead is still improving, as I learn from a letter of the 22nd from a friend at Philadelphia, who called on him. You speak of rumours that a division exists in the Cabinet. I say to you, and Mr. Taylor and John, what I say to no others but my own family who are near me, politically speaking there is no division, but some unpleasant circumstances have occurred to affect the harmony of social intercourse between the females of some of the families, originating probably, and stimulated by ultimate political views of aspirants to office. Major Eaton is known to be the intimate friend of the President. The extreme jealousy of some of Mr. Calhoun's friends induces them to believe that Major Eaton is rather more friendly to Mr. Van Buren than to Mr. Calhoun.

They fear his influence will control the Executive patronage in favor of Mr. Van B. They want him to leave the Cabinet, and are willing to give him any other office whatever. The President brought Major Eaton in against his inclination, and will not part with him. To compel him to do so, is the cause of the attack on Mrs. E. Judge McLean, Mr. Berrien and others, who are now unwilling to exchange civilities with Mrs. Eaton, were *present* at her marriage to Major E., and it is believed if Major E. were not now in the Cabinet, that Mrs. Eaton would be unmolested. I am on good terms with all the members of the Cabinet, and so is Mrs. B. with the families of all, but we would not join in the prosecution of Major and Mrs. E. Mr. Van Buren and myself thought, and have acted, alike on this subject; so does the President. The females of the President's family until lately did not exchange civilities with Mrs. E.

The gentlemen, Mr. Ingham, Berrien and Calhoun are, and have been all along, personally friendly with and civil to Major E. (Mrs. Calhoun is not here). Mr. Branch and Major E. had a personal difference. Mr. Berrien and myself were present at an interview between them; they were reconciled and are now friends. Harmony prevails at present, personally as well as politically. On the 23rd Inst. we had a Cabinet dinner. All were present but Mr. Berrien, who was sick. Mr. [Mrs.?] Eaton and Mrs. Donaldson and the other ladies were present and exchanged the usual civilities. A few impudent men and women of our own party, stimulated by the coalition, still are busy with Mrs. Eaton's character. She, however, is sustained by the Foreign Ministers; indeed,

¹⁴ Mrs. Eaton.

a favourite with some of them because of her prosecution, and by many members of Congress of both houses and their families. Society is unhappily divided about her, but her circle of acquaintance is large and respectable. My family visit all parties and will continue to do so. I will not join the band of calumniators and will stand by and sustain Major E. against such vile assaults; but his and Mrs. Eaton's difficulties are not mine, nor do they desire me to consider them so. I believe my course has endeared me to General Jackson; it has to Major E., and some of Mr. Calhoun's friends are jealous of me, but utterly without cause, for I like Mr. C. as I do Mr. Van B., but I like General Jackson better than either, and will allow myself to think of no other candidate for the next Presidential term but General Jackson, and this should be the language of all friends; it will prevent divisions in our own ranks. I have not time to add more, but may continue the subject hereafter when I have leisure. My love to all our friends, Mr. Taylor and your sweet babes.

Your affectionate Father,

W. T. BARRY.

VIII. BARRY TO MRS. TAYLOR.

[WASHINGTON, May 24, 1831.]

I cannot say at this time when I shall visit Kentucky. The late changes in the Cabinet makes it necessary for me to remain near the President until the new Secretaries arrive. Judge White, on account of domestic affliction, having recently lost his wife, and one of his only two remaining children being now in the last stages of consumption, declines accepting the War Department. It is not yet determined whom it will be offered to next. P. P. Barbour of Va. and Col. Drayton of So. Carolina are talked of; it will most probably be the latter. You will see from the papers that Mr. Branch has gone off in a pet; however, since he arrived in No. Carolina he has regained his senses, and says, in accepting an invitation to become a candidate for Congress, that he will, if elected, support the measures of the present administration. Mr. Ingham, it is believed, will behave more prudently; he will probably remain in the Treasury Department until Mr. McLane returns from Europe, and then, if he desires it, go as Minister to Russia in place of Mr. Randolph, who is expected to return home this fall.

Mr. Van Buren will, if he desires, go to England. Major Eaton returns to Tennessee for a season, not decided on his future course. I shall remain, not for the reason assigned, that the President would not accept my resignation until I clear up the charges against me; this story got afloat in consequence of a remark of the President to Mr. Branch, who very indelicately asked the President when he was informed by the latter of the necessity of reorganizing his Cabinet and shown the resignation of Mr. Van Buren and Major Eaton, what I intended to do, the President replied that when appraised of the resignations of Mr. Van Buren and Major Eaton, that I had promptly tendered mine, which he declined accepting, at which Mr. Branch expressed some surprise at the discrimination in my favour. The President, to save his feelings as much as possible, instead of stating the real cause, that I had done nothing to forfeit his confidence, remarked that I had been wantonly assailed, in a manner that no other member of the Cabinet had, and that

if it were proper for me to retire he would not consent to it, as it might be cause of triumph to my unprincipled persecutors. I was advised of Major Eaton's and Mr. Van Buren's intentions long before they were sent in, and was advised with as to the propriety of their course. It was not known whether the other members of the Cabinet would resign or whether General Jackson would be compelled to remove them. To cut off all excuse and open the way for freedom of action on the part of the President, I offered my resignation. When I did so he instantly said "No, there is no cause for your retiring; I have reluctantly parted with my confidential friend, Major Eaton, and I want you to remain with me whilst I am in office." Mr. Berrien is yet absent; it is not known whether he will resign or not; if he should, as is probable, in the event of Col. Drayton's appointment to the War Department, the Honorable Mr. Bell of Tennessee will be Attorney General. If P. P. Barbour of Va. should be made Secretary of War, the Honorable J. Buchanan of Penn. will be Attorney General. The President enjoys good health. Mr. Livingston and Mr. Woodbury are here. In future we hope for harmony and united action. A great Jackson meeting was held in this City last evening. They adopted resolutions approving of General Jackson's administration and recommending his reelection for another term. General Duffe Green attended, affected to be friendly, but advocated resolutions that he procured to be offered, expressing confidence in J. C. Calhoun and recommending him again as a candidate for the Vice Presidency. His resolutions were rejected by an overwhelming majority. . . .

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Roman History and Mythology. Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS.
(New York: The Macmillan Company. 1910. Pp. iii, 427.)

THIS collection of scientific papers by former pupils of Professor Sanders, and presumably written at his suggestion and under his supervision, makes contributions of value in the solution of several important and perplexing historical problems.

The first article in it (pp. 1-159), by Orma Fitch Butler, which bears the title *Studies in the Life of Heliogabalus*, contains in its three main chapters an analysis of the critical literature bearing on the "Scriptores Historiae Augustae", a history of the years 218-222 A. D., and a critical examination of the *Vita Heliogabali*. Perhaps there is no more complex series of questions in higher criticism than is presented by the *Historia Augusta*, and it would be hard to find a more interesting episode in historical study than is furnished by the attempts which scholars have made to solve the problems involved. The questions which this piece of literature raises concern the date of composition of the several Lives, their sources, authenticity, and historical value. The way in which each of these has in turn been made the central point of attack since 1838, and the methods which have been used in investigating them, by studying the historical references, the dedications in the manuscripts, the language, and even the rhythmical structure, have been analyzed and set forth with admirable skill in the preliminary chapter. The most important original contribution which the paper makes consists in a critical examination (pp. 109-157) of that portion of the *Vita* (chs. 1, 4-2, 3; 3, 1-18, 3) which deals with the history of the reign of Heliogabalus. The historical accuracy of these chapters is tested by comparing them with a history of the period which the writer reconstructs from other sources. Both these parts of the monograph show learning, critical acumen, and good judgment, and the author's method of attacking the question is sound.

Similarly, John Garrett Winter's treatment of the Myth of Hercules at Rome (pp. 171-274) resolves itself into two main parts—a preliminary study of the modern literature dealing with the Hercules story, and an attempt to resolve the myth into its elements and to determine the earliest form which it took at Rome. The writer concludes that "Hercules was not a home-spun Italic deity", that the Cacus element was not a part of the original story, that the Greek Herakles myth and

worship were introduced into Rome from both southern Italy and Etruria, and that the title was probably of Phoenician origin.

Roman Law Studies in Livy (pp. 275-354), by Alvin E. Evans, furnishes an interesting body of material, which to be complete must be supplemented from other sources, and so far as the questions are concerned with which it deals constitutes a useful contribution to our knowledge. We could have wished, however, that in addition to the points for discussion mentioned on page 325, and later, the author's plan had included a consideration of the development of tribunician jurisdiction, the responsibility to the popular assembly of different classes of magistrates for their political action, and certain other related matters. The last paper by Laura Bayne Woodruff on Reminiscences of Ennius in Silius Italicus (pp. 355-424) falls outside the field of this journal.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

The Monuments of Christian Rome from Constantine to the Renaissance. By ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Ph.D., Professor of Archaeology and Ancient History at Princeton University. [Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities.] (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. vii, 412.)

IN this work the author does not exceed the limits expressed by the title. He has not attempted to write a history of Christian art in Rome, but has confined himself to an account of the monuments of architecture, painting, and sculpture between the era of the persecutions and the Renaissance. The subject is dealt with in two sections. In the first there is a chronological account of the principal monuments and in the second these are systematically classified as Basilicas, Campanili, Cloisters, Civil Architecture, Military Architecture, Sculpture and Painting. The work is not at all technical and makes no elaborate pretense at describing details of style or construction. Though he frequently touches on the subject, the summary character of the historical survey may be the author's excuse for not having discussed expressly the origins of Christian art. This is all the more to be regretted because the various influences which were at work within Christianity itself, and which were being gradually moulded to its new concept of life and society, would seem to form the necessary background for a detailed exposition of any phase of art, which the author himself considers to have been "as integral a part of civilization as politics, religion, sociology or literature". Some of the historical statements, closely interwoven with the central theme, may be open to serious exception. Thus (p. 38) the author says: "The origin of monasticism was due to the bitterness of the delusion of the really religious, who saw that, since fashion and authority had stamped Christianity with their approval, the Church as a unit had become infected with most of the soft vices of paganism." Such an assertion is hardly in keeping with the facts in the history of

the development of Christian asceticism, and utterly ignores the prevailing tendency in theological thought and philosophic teaching outside as well as inside the Church. On page 39 we read: "The establishment of Christian festivals on the same dates as pagan ones, and with analogous ceremonies, made it easy for the populace to pass over to the new faith without the loss of the pomp and circumstance and play that were so necessary to these materialists, however reformed." This confusion of popular festival and liturgical observance is very common, but it is based on an utter misconception of the character and history of the Christian liturgy, which was such a potent factor in determining some lines of artistic effort.

The author's expressed hope that the book "may serve in the classroom" would be more certain of realization had he provided it with a good bibliography, or with adequate references. The work contains much food for discussion, and it would be satisfactory at times to know where some of its views are stated more in detail, and on what foundations they rest. Taken as a whole, however, the work is an excellent and painstaking presentation of an interesting subject.

La Campagna Romana, Antica, Medioevale e Moderna. By GIUSEPPE TOMASSETTI. Volume II. *Via Appia, Ardeatina ed Aurelia.* (Rome: Ermanno Loescher and Company. 1910. Pp. xi, 562.)

WITH this second volume¹ begins the principal part of this monumental work, that is, the history and description of every part of the Campagna. The division is geographical, and the itinerary of the author follows the line of each of the great roads that stretch out in all directions from Rome. The first three in alphabetical order, Appia, Ardeatina, and Aurelia, are contained in the present volume, four-fifths of its space being devoted to the Appia, which was not only the most famous and interesting in antiquity of the *viae* that crossed the plains of Latium, but also the most important in medieval and modern times on account of the towns situated on its line, such as Albano, Genzano, Velletri, and Anzio.

The method adopted is to give first a brief historical notice of the road itself, with a description of its course and monuments within the city of Rome. This is apt to be done in a somewhat perfunctory and not very satisfactory way, and the author's knowledge of the topography of the city leaves somewhat to be desired, as is illustrated by his acceptance of Canina's theory of the location of the Porta Fontinalis. After this introductory matter, each site on the road or in its immediate vicinity is taken up in order. In the case of the more important places a bibliography is given of all works dealing expressly with the site in question, omitting general works that treat of others as well. This is followed by a résumé of the history of the place in antiquity if it dates back so far, information as to the character and publication of its

¹ For a notice of vol. I. see this REVIEW, XV. 831.

inscriptions, and an enumeration of the most important works of art that have been found in the vicinity. This section is generally only introductory to the history of the site in medieval and modern times. Here the author gives an abstract in chronological order of the information that he has collected from earlier publications and from his own researches in state, family, and municipal archives, as well as from investigations on the spot. This matter is accompanied by comments and is followed by a description of the medieval monuments that still exist. What we have, therefore, in the case of the principal towns, is a series of virtual monographs of considerable extent, forty pages, for instance, being devoted to Albano.

The amount of labor involved in this research has been very great, and the extent and variety of the material that has been investigated may be illustrated by the first abstract concerning Velletri, which is found in a letter written in 496 A. D. by Pope Gelasius I. to the Bishop of Velletri, with reference to a runaway slave who had taken refuge in the church of S. Clemente in Rome. The work has been done with great care and patience, and the result is in most cases eminently satisfactory. Now and then one might wish that the sifting had been a little more careful and that some extraneous matter like the full description of the contest between Milo and Clodius, or the panegyric pronounced upon a certain worthy matron of Civit  Lavinia, of the eighteenth century, had been omitted. Exception might also be taken to identifications like that of Osteriaccia with the inn where Horace spent the first night out from Rome on his famous journey to Brundisium, but in general full meed of praise is to be ungrudgingly bestowed upon the veteran scholar who has done more than any one else to interpret the Campagna to those who would read its meaning.

When the third volume of this book is published, and the remaining parts of Ashby's notable studies on the Classical Topography of the Campagna in the *Papers of the British School in Rome*, we shall have a historical description of this region more complete and comprehensive than exists for any other.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. Iubente Regia Societate Gottingensi conguessit PAULUS FRIDOLINUS KEHR. Tomus I. *Italia Pontificia sive Repertorium Privilegiorum et Litterarum a Romanis Pontificibus ante annum MCLXXXVIII Italiae Ecclesiis, Monasteriis, Civitatibus, Singulisque Personis Concessorum.* Volume III. *Etruria.* (Berlin: Weidmann. 1908. Pp. lii, 492.)

THE character and purpose of this new edition of the letters and privileges of the Roman pontiffs and the manner in which it differs in order and arrangement from the edition of Jaff  have been fully de-

scribed in the notice of the first and second volumes which appeared in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIII. 318. This third volume contains the *Acta Romanorum Pontificum* relating to Etruria or Tuscany. It is not the fault of the editor if the name Etruria or Tuscany does not convey a clear idea of geographical limits to the mind of the historian; for Italian provinces and principalities in the ease and frequency with which they contracted or expanded their boundaries have a character almost as misleading and a meaning sometimes more confusing than Burgundy itself. As the *Regesta* in this edition are arranged according to dioceses, an additional element of confusion arises from the fact that ecclesiastical geography is made the basis for subdivisions of territory which was purely civil in character. That this disposition of the material does not make for clearness is evident from the fact that the correspondence of the popes with Mathilda, countess of Tuscany, is to be found in another volume under Canossa, notwithstanding the fact that this volume in addition to the documents addressed to churches and monasteries contains some which were sent to different rulers of Tuscany. In his introduction Kehr has wisely made no attempt to justify or explain his method of division, and while calling attention to the fact that many dioceses which in the Middle Ages belonged to Etruria are dealt with in other volumes, he here limits himself to the twelve dioceses of Florence, Fiesole, Pistoia, Arezzo, Siena, Chiusi, Sovana, Grosseto, Massa Marittima, Volterra, Pisa, and Lucca.

There can be no doubt but the plan which is followed in this edition of the *Regesta* is one which would lend itself admirably to the preparation of such a work as the projected *Germania Sacra* of Kehr and Brackmann but it will always remain an open question among historians whether the chronological order of Jaffé was wisely abandoned. Correspondence is of course equally important when arranged either according to the sender or the recipient. Those investigators, however, whose work is to study periods or pontificates cannot but regret the necessity of seeking their material in every volume of this edition. On the other hand, no better arrangement is possible for the study of the history of localities or separate churches. One serious drawback in Kehr's work, which cannot fail to strike even the casual reader, comes from the cumbersome manner of reference to which it will be necessary to resort. The documents are numbered according to volumes so that the volume as well as the number must be indicated. This method cannot fail to be irksome as it is necessary to refer to the *clenchus* in the beginning of each volume for the serial number. A reference to the volume, page, and number of the document on the page will sometimes lead to extreme confusion, as for instance on page 103 of this volume three documents are numbered one, the number referring to three different recipients. Making due allowance for the objections which may be raised regarding the peculiar manner in which the materials are arranged there can be no question regarding the completeness with which the new edition has demonstrated its superiority over the old. Of the 1501 documents here

presented only 754 are to be found in Jaffé and his continuation. This fact alone, not to speak of the wealth of critical references to sources and the well-selected bibliographies at the head of each chapter, will make the work absolutely essential for the study of early and medieval church history.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF. Volume V., Part II. *The Middle Ages, from Boniface VIII., 1294, to the Protestant Reformation, 1517.* By DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1910. Pp. xi, 795.)

THIS work closes the gap in the row of broad-backed tomes which the University of Berlin, on the occasion of Dr. Philip Schaff's jubilee, called "the most notable monument of universal historical learning produced by the school of Neander". The single volume allotted by the elder Schaff to the period from Hildebrand to Leo X. has in the hands of his son become two, of which the first, part I., was published in 1907. It is especially fortunate that the portrayal of the three centuries from Boniface VIII. to Luther should have been postponed these seventeen years since the death of Dr. Philip Schaff, for the past two decades have been unusually fruitful in investigations of this very era, which render this volume perhaps the most useful of the series. With careful bibliographies, it is an invaluable summary of recent researches.

Loyal to the tradition of frank piety as well as of ripe scholarship, the son has not merely been faithful to the spirit of his father's work; he has adhered in general to his methods of dividing the material. Whether the inherited style of arrangement is theoretically the best or not, it is here carried out with virtuosity. The result is a clear, straightforward narrative, which seldom betrays the conservatively Protestant theological standpoint of its author. The preface states his desire to be objective: "to depict it as it was and to allow the picture of high religious purpose to reveal itself side by side with the picture of hierarchical assumption and scholastic misinterpretation". Sympathy with some of the religious aspects of the Middle Ages is shown by the unusually comprehensive treatment of themes such as the German Mystics, the Pulpit and Popular Piety, also of those men whom the author stoutly believes worthy of the title, Reformers before the Reformation. Antipathies are, however, occasionally manifest, as when he unhesitatingly speaks of papal "arrogance" and "assumption", and inveighs especially against the infallibility of the pope, using arguments drawn from the deliverances of Innocent III. against Magna Charta, of Innocent VIII. against witchcraft, and from Alexander VI.'s Bull of Demarcation, objections which will not carry overmuch weight with him who ponders the carefully phrased definitions of the Vatican Council. Similarly uncon-

vincing to many will be the ancient Donatist argument from the immoral lives of ecclesiastics to the invalidity of certain of their claims, as when he says (p. 465): "The papal theory of the succession of Peter, even if there were no other hostile historic testimony, would founder on the personality of Alexander VI., who set an example of all depravity." It would have been better to admit the facts, as does Pastor, without drawing conclusions from such tacit premises, just as it would have been well to exercise more reticence concerning harrowing details about witchcraft (§ 59), the revival of paganism (§ 67), and the vices of the clergy (§ 73). Even then the author would have remained true to his purpose of refuting as idealizations the accounts of the later Middle Ages presented by Janssen and Gasquet, who believe that the Church might have been reformed peaceably from within. In general a sympathetic critic of medieval Christianity, Dr. Schaff has been measurably successful in showing that the Reformation was the inevitable consequence of the misdeeds of the militant papacy.

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL.

Les Comptes du Roi René. Publiés d'après les Originaux Inédits Conservés aux Archives des Bouches-du-Rhône. Tome Deuxième, Tome Troisième. Par l'Abbé G. ARNAUD D'AGNEL, Correspondant du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique pour les Travaux Historiques. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1909, 1910. Pp. 490; 511.)

THE student of culture history who has the imagination to interpret medieval statistics in terms of human activity will rejoice that these two supplementary volumes of the accounts of King René have appeared. As in the first volume, the summaries are in chronological order and after the calendar form, though occasionally complete documents are inserted. As one reads page after page of these summaries, the whole life of the court and the upper middle classes—less that of the peasantry—and the relation of government to Provençal society is unveiled, as well as the foreign relations of Provence, especially those of a culture nature, with Europe at large. The history of industry and commerce has many details, especially the manufacture of small arms, jewelry, ivory, and leather goods, the trade in drugs, cloth, silks, taffetas, velours, etc., and wine. There are many data, unimportant in detail but collectively of value, bearing upon markets and fairs, weights and measures, days of work for artisans, masons, carpenters, and craftsmen. In this connection the activity of the Jews as bankers, and the relations of Provence to the banking house of the Medici, is noteworthy. Though the connection with Italy is more intimate than with other countries, it is interesting to observe the intimate connection between Provence and Germany in the fifteenth century. One meets with German artisans in many crafts, glovers, metal workers, masons. German minstrels and acrobats were popular in southern France. *Per contra*, there are only three allusions

to England and the English, which shows how far removed from the island kingdom the history of the house of Anjou has become since the days of Henry VI. It is a matter of surprise also to observe how relatively slight were the relations between the counts of Provence and the French crown. Louis XI. is directly mentioned but once, and the royal court but sixteen times. With Paris as a city, however, Provence had close connection, as also with Anjou and northwestern France as a matter of course.

The history of art, especially sculpture, less painting—the king's court painter was a German named Bartholomew Deick—is often mentioned. Gunpowder is alluded to once and stone cannon-balls four times, which shows what every historian of the art of war knows, that the discovery of gunpowder made little change in the history of war until late in the sixteenth century. Very valuable are the complete inventories of property in the king's various capitals, which are printed intact, for they enable us to see the *ensemble* of court life in Provence, at least the material side of it. Considerable technical information as to the method of keeping accounts might be dug out of these inventories and the excerpts dealing with the collection of the revenues.

Occasionally there are allusions to social phenomena of interest or importance. There is much material dealing with the history of charity, with prostitution, with astrology and superstition. Playing cards are mentioned seven times; slaves four times. The practice of nicking or piercing the ears of the half-wild cattle in the marshy country around the embouchures of the Rhone reminds us of the same practice on our western plains, which is sometimes adopted instead of branding. Snails apparently were not a favorite food in Provence in the Middle Ages, for though there is much information about the king's table, snails are mentioned but once.

The philologist will find much of interest upon the history of the derivation and use of words, and may be interested in a Christian Turk "*qui seet parler tous languaiges*" (no. 2705). There seems to have been a certain affectation of things Turkish in the luxurious court of Provence. Turkish confitures and Turkish fashions were popular and we even meet with a Provençal knight named Saladin. As to institutional history, one finds the use of the word *universitas* in the sense of commune (no. 3194), a usage peculiar to the town charters of Provence and Languedoc. But far and away the most interesting and tantalizing allusion is the one which apparently refers to the art of printing in the time of King René (no. 708-709). It may be recalled that France has recently put forth a rival to Gutenberg. In 1890 the Abbé Requin discovered in the archives of Avignon a contract of the year 1444 between one Procopius Waldfoghel, a native of Prague, and a Jew of Avignon, named Davin, in which the former agreed to teach the latter "the art of writing artificially". The Jew furnished the capital for the enterprise and on March 10, 1446, Waldfoghel contracted to provide "*litteras formatas, scisas in ferro*". On March 26 we find him providing "*omnia*

artificia, ingenia et instrumenta ad scribendum artificialiter in litera latina". Other details follow. There are two alphabets in steel letters, two iron forms and one iron vise, forty-eight forms in base metal. (See Abbé Requin, *L'Imprimerie à Avignon en 1444*, Paris, 1890, and his *Les Origines de l'Imprimerie en France*, Paris, 1891.) The "art of writing artificially" is certainly the art of printing. Waiving the vexed question as to whether Waldfoghel was indebted to Gutenberg or his co-laborers, it remains an interesting question what bearing, if any, these new Provençal documents with their tantalizing allusion to "lettres moulées" (no. 708-709) have upon the history of the discovery of printing. Apparently the editor is unacquainted with the work of the Abbé Requin, else he could hardly have failed to have attached a greater importance to these documents than he has done.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Tableaux de Dépréciation du Papier-Monnaie. Réédités avec une Introduction par PIERRE CARON. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1909. Pp. lxxxv, 458.)

THIS is a reprint of the official tables of the depreciation of the paper money issued in France during the Revolution, first printed early in 1798 and again in 1825. Both these early prints are extremely rare.

To this reprint of the tables, M. Caron has written an introduction of great value, and one which all future students of the assignats will have to consult. He has limited himself in the first and most notable part of the introduction to a careful study of the various laws enacted by the Convention and by the Directory determining the discharge in depreciated paper of contracts between individuals. This is a subject which has hitherto scarcely been touched by historians.

The first attempt to correct the situation created by the depreciation of the assignats was brought about by the necessities of the government, following the repeal of the maximum laws. The assignats were then depreciated ninety per cent. The government received them at par, though it was compelled to pay for its supplies in specie. The consequence was, M. Caron tells us, that "as depreciation continued public receipts diminished, while expenditures increased." The law of June 21, 1795, put an end to this situation and saved the government from bankruptcy. The next step was to take up the status of debts between individuals. Debtors were defrauding their creditors every day by forcing them to accept assignats at their face value for debts contracted months or years before in specie, or in assignats at a much higher rate. Laws were now passed to regulate payment of debts so contracted. In 1795 there was such legislation on June 21, July 13, and December 3; in 1796 on April 4, July 17 and 23; in 1797 on February 3, June 23, August 31, September 1, and December 1; in 1798 on January 5, February 1, April 24 and 25, May 10, June 27, and August 14. This virtually closed the series of laws relating to the discharge of private debts,

though a law of May 6, 1799, touched the subject slightly, and the Council of Five Hundred had the matter of a complete revision of the various laws before it when its sessions were terminated by Bonaparte.

M. Caron's study shows clearly the immense difficulty the government was under in enacting any satisfactory legislation to meet the situation. Some of the earlier laws were hastily passed, and in some cases only for a short period in order to meet an emergency, as for example the laws suspending the payments of debts. Laws like these made confusion worse confounded. The law of December 3, 1795, Caron says, "incommoded business" and "paralyzed commerce". Again, when the mandates were created, the legislators thought that they were through with their difficulties. Mandats were as good as specie, they asserted, and therefore it was sufficient to enact that all debts should be paid in mandates or in specie. After their long experience with paper money, they were so simple as to believe that the mandates would not depreciate. Less than a month disabused them of this confidence, and they saw themselves compelled to begin all over again.

The second division of M. Caron's introduction is devoted to the law which decreed the compilation of the tables here reprinted. This law was passed June 23, 1797. M. Caron considers the provisions of the law, the manner in which the tables were drawn up, and the results as to their accuracy. The central authorities of each department, assisted by fifteen business men, drew up the tables. They were made out to cover the dates from January 1, 1791, to July 17, 1796. The authorities of the departments were to determine the depreciation of the paper money for each month in that period by using a table of such depreciation made up by the Treasury at Paris, comparing this with any such table as the department might have kept, and with the prices of real estate, food, and merchandise at each of the several dates. The task was extremely difficult. In some cases the statistics on which the calculation was to be made could not be secured; again, in regard to certain dates, the department of the Aube, and presumably other departments as well, fixed a figure for the depreciation arbitrarily. The resulting tables naturally show an enormous variation in the value of assignats in the various departments at the same date. Indeed the tables do not pretend to show more than an approximation to the actual depreciation, a fact which must be remembered by students who undertake to make use of them.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

Napoléon et la Catalogne, 1808-1814. La Captivité de Barcelone (Février 1808-Janvier 1810). Par PIERRE CONARD, Ancien Élève de l'École Normale Supérieure, Docteur ès Lettres. [Bibliothèque de la Fondation Thiers, Fascicule XVIII.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1909. Pp. xlv, 474.)

Napoléon et la Pologne, 1806-1807. D'après les Documents des Archives Nationales et des Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. Par MARCEL HANDELSMAN de Varsovie. Approuvée par M. le professeur MEYER v. KNONAU. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1909. Pp. iv, 280.)

M. CONARD's original design was "d'étudier le rôle des Français dans la transformation de l'Espagne et de mesurer, pour ainsi dire, l'importance de l'influence française dans la péninsule au temps du roi Joseph"; this design was reduced by a closer acquaintance with the material to that of furnishing "une petite contribution à l'étude du régime française en Espagne". The reasons for finally selecting Catalonia are stated to have been the fact that the material for the Napoleonic history of this region is practically all to be found in the archives at Paris, that during this period "la Catalogne a eu sa vie propre, presque particulière", and that Napoleon aimed to annex it. It is evident at a glance that the study of the rôle of the French in the transformation of Spain might well assume terrifying proportions in M. Conard's mind, since the present stout volume comprises only two years of the occupation in one corner of the kingdom.

Nevertheless the student of the Napoleonic empire can have no quarrel with M. Conard but may rather hope that his admirable spirit and conscientious methods may inspire other laborers in such neglected corners. For he has furnished us with a study that is in its kind a model and almost beyond reproach; one would despair of gleaning after M. Conard and he constantly brings home to us the way and degree in which exhaustive work in a limited field can throw light upon general conditions. The critical studies of the primary sources in the preface and appendixes are of very unusual merit, and the former especially, with its acute analyses of classes of documents and its suggestions as to comparative values, will be of service to all students of the Napoleonic archival material. The rather surprising statement that the material for this study is almost entirely in the French archives is shown to be based upon an exhaustive search in Catalonia itself—a search establishing the conviction that "les relations entre le gouvernement censé Joséphiste de Catalogne et le gouvernement central furent presque nulles" and that though the municipal changes can be studied to advantage in a few places the French on their departure destroyed or removed practically all documents of general interest.

The author's critical acumen and good judgment are not confined to the studies above cited but appear throughout in such a way as to inspire entire confidence in his use of his material. Good examples are the remark (p. 33, note) with reference to the genesis of the invasion of Spain: "Rien n'est plus difficile que de déterminer de quand date un projet napoléonien; car l'Empereur n'admettait les personnes de son entourage à la connaissance de ses desseins qu'à partir du moment où il avait besoin de leur concours et dans la mesure seulement où cela

lui était nécessaire", and in the doubts he raises (p. 65, note) as to the value of the reports sent to the emperor when the conditions were not of a kind to please him or support his plans. M. Conard does not go out of his way to recapitulate or discuss events beyond his own field, but he keeps the general situation well in view and constantly casts light upon it. The conditions special to Catalonia are clearly set forth, but we nevertheless feel that we are adding much to our knowledge of the nature of the national rising, of the defects of the French methods, of the faults in the French military organization and discipline, of the decline in the quality of the troops (in Catalonia they were largely German and Italian, and we see how that general deterioration through the increase of foreign levies is now setting strongly in), of the confusion and lack of co-operation between civil and military authorities, of the absence of general control in Spain and the practical neglect of the imperial orders, of the nature of the military oppression and the ruin caused by the occupation. It is shown that though Napoleon was far from being in such close touch with the situation as he supposed he yet cannot escape the chief responsibility in view of the fact that he had proceeded deliberately on the principle of terrorizing the Spaniards. It was in vain that later the imperial administration sought to make scapegoats of the provincial commanders: "Le vrai responsable de la ruine de Barcelone, de la désertion d'Ampurdan, de la misère et de l'exaspération des Catalans était Napoleon" (p. 384).

The author's plan is indicated by the chapter-headings: La Catalogne en 1808; Les Catalans et l'Intrusion Française; Les Nécessités Militaires et le Gouvernement Improvisé; Le Roi Joseph et le Gouvernement Improvisé; Les Finances du Gouvernement Improvisé; Les Mesures de Sûreté et la Police du Gouvernement Improvisé; Les Résultats et les Responsabilités du Régime. There is appended a map of Catalonia and a good index.

The dissertation of M. Handelsman takes us to the remotest north-eastern corner of the empire and the author approaches his task much more from the European point of view than in the case of M. Conard's study. The result is creditable both to M. Handelsman and to Professor Meyer von Knonau and though not without blemish may legitimately arouse high expectations as to future work. The young author has already indeed a formidable list of titles to his credit and wields the pen of an experienced and effective writer, endowed with greater gifts of presentation perhaps than is M. Conard. He aims here "de tracer un tableau politique de la Pologne qui doit servir de fond à l'action de Napoléon, figurer l'objet de ses rapports et de sa politique et faire ressortir les causes et le cours d'une révolution nationale". On the whole this aim is well attained and in all parts of the study dealing directly with Polish conditions we find serious contributions to our knowledge; the importance of the contribution in the wider field indicated by the title (and especially aimed at by the writer) is less manifest. But the Napoleonic policy is at all times clearly and convincingly set forth, and little

doubt can remain both as to the entire absence during this period of any intention of restoring Poland, and of the cold duplicity with which the emperor manipulated the Polish aspirations and movements as pawns in the diplomatic game with Prussia and Russia.

As hinted above M. Handelsman's work is not without blemish. His claim to be presenting "le premier essai . . . d'une définition scientifique des rapports de Napoléon et de la Pologne" exposes him to special attention on the score of technique, and it is disappointing to find that here his treatise is much more open to criticism than is the more modest one of M. Conard. Instead of a full critical description of the primary material used we have only a brief enumerating note in the preface and a list of uncommented titles as appendix. Pages 177-257 are occupied by selections from the *inédit* (presumably), and while we have reason to be grateful for this important addition to the accessible material, we regret to find the documents printed without annotation of any kind, without any indication of the completeness with which they are inserted, and without any references to the portions of the text that they illustrate. We are frequently in doubt as to *provenance* and are for the most part left entirely without that personal data that is so thoroughly supplied by M. Conard. This defect is of course particularly serious with regard to material of so inaccessible a sort as that in the Polish language (M. Handelsman prints only French translations). The use of the sources throughout the study seems for the most part thorough and worthy of confidence; but there are some lapses, as when (p. 6) the author depends for an important statement put into the mouth of Napoleon on a memoir (Comeau) apparently known to him only through a recent secondary writer (Lorraine Petre), or when (p. 13) he modifies a quotation from a letter of the emperor by italicizing without warning to the reader.

These are not serious blots on the work of a young writer. The treatment as a whole shows thorough mastery of the material and unusual powers of presentation, and is free from any appearance of overladen or indiscriminate research. Having traced the development in the autumn of 1806 of the attitude of Napoleon to the Poles, M. Handelsman presents a very instructive review of Polish internal conditions under the Prussian government and during the early French occupations as preliminary to a following of the part played by the Polish question in the development of the peace of Tilsit. In regard to the general situation and the interview between the sovereigns at Tilsit the ordinary secondary authorities are used. As to the question of Poland M. Handelsman does not entirely accept the contention of Schilder that the creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw is to be attributed to Alexander rather than to Napoleon, but advances instead, with sufficient evidence to render it plausible, the hypothesis that Napoleon offered Poland to Alexander under the condition that Silesia should be assigned to Jerome, that Alexander's relations to Prussia made it impossible for

him to agree to this, and that finally the czar accepted freely a proposition advanced by Napoleon as intended especially to establish a barrier state between the French and Russian empires. "Le Duché devait être en somme l'œuvre d'un compromis, le résultat des divergences d'intérêts dynastiques et d'actualités diplomatiques, mais la paternité de cette création devait revenir à Napoléon et à personne d'autre" (p. 132).

The study concludes with a careful examination of the organization of the Grand Duchy under "une forme politique absolument nouvelle"; the force of this description is not manifest, as on the author's own showing it was simply an imitation of the Napoleonic combination of autocratic monarchy and parliamentary forms. It is perhaps to be regretted that M. Handelsman did not undertake his study more from the same point of view as M. Conard, as in that case he would probably have developed more thoroughly the Polish material (the work was done almost wholly in the French archives and the Polish material cited has the appearance of being fragmentary), and have been led to the later administrative history of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. This difference of point of view in these cases is as instructive as the difference of method, and these treatises might perhaps well serve as an object lesson for those entrusted with the direction of youthful research in the field of history.

VICTOR COFFIN.

Napoléon et le Roi Murat, 1808-1815. Par ALBERT ESPITALIER.
(Paris: Perrin et Cie. 1910. Pp. vi, 519.)

THIS book is an exposition of personality rather than of events. Four causes have produced, during the past fifteen years, a considerable literature upon Murat, his wife, his kingdom, and his execution. As a matter of family pride, his descendants are publishing his correspondence, which the fourth volume brings down to 1806; and they have sought to clear his reputation in *Murat, Lieutenant de l'Empereur en Espagne* (reviewed in this journal, III. 363). The interest in the family of Napoleon has brought Murat and his wife within the scope of the investigations of Napoleonic scholars like Masson and Baron Lumbroso, and of more popular writers like Turquan. The psychological and tragic interest in his abandonment of Napoleon, his relations with Austria, and his execution at Pizzo in 1815 has added works by Sassenay, Schirmer, Weil, and Lumbroso to the older ones on the same subject. Finally, the interest in the history of the Risorgimento has attracted Italian writers, and has produced the only important work in English since the translation of Colletta's well-known history of Naples, namely, Professor R. M. Johnston's *Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy and the Rise of the Secret Societies* (2 vols., 1904). There also have been published memoirs or biographies of several of the soldiers and officials associated with Murat in Naples. Not a few articles have appeared in historical periodicals, and during the past year M. Vandal has been contributing "Le Roi et la Reine de Naples" to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

The present volume is apparently the first venture of the author. It is well written and has abundant citations of authorities, though too often the precise reference to page or date is lacking. Acknowledgments are made to earlier writers, especially to Weil; but more notable is the use of many documents from the archives in Paris, Naples, Vienna, and London, and the collections of the Società Napolitana di Storia Patria.

As the title indicates, M. Espitalier studies Murat from the angle of his relations with Napoleon. He regards Murat, as he thinks Napoleon did, and as historians have been too wont to do, as merely a successful soldier destitute of political sense; and as a Frenchman, he sees in Murat's interest in Italian unity only the desperate resort of a disappointed ambition, a treason to Napoleon, or rather to France in the hour of need. Napoleonic in sentiments and point of view, he sees no possibility of a definite, let alone an honorable, policy on the part of Murat. For him, the ultimate sin blackens the whole life.

The ethics of every-day life fail to explain Murat. He was an adventurer in an age of glorified adventurers. Bonaparte's remarkable rise to imperial power turned the heads, not only of his brothers and sisters, but also of his comrades in arms. They aspired to independent position, overlooking their vast indebtedness to their great brother and general; but Bernadotte alone realized his ingrate ambition. Napoleon, in the words of Berthier, bade Joseph, Louis, Jerome, and Joachim: "Pour vos sujets soyez roi, pour l'Empereur soyez un vice-roi." Napoleon's cosmopolitanism never sensed the spirit of nationality, but Louis and Joseph and Murat each caught something of the spirit of the peoples they were set to rule, even as Bernadotte did in Sweden. Murat had, as brilliant cavalry officer and as brother-in-law, a double claim upon Napoleon. He and his ambitious and intriguing wife, Caroline, had cause to feel badly rewarded with Naples when they saw the inconsequential Joseph supplant him in Spain. Napoleon never considered the interests of the subkingdoms apart from his own; Murat gave priority to the welfare of Naples—obviously base disloyalty to the emperor. Later, when he saw the power of his brother-in-law crumble, Murat shrewdly grasped the opportunity to gratify his thwarted ambitions by identifying himself with the spirit of Italian nationality. Had he merely sought Italian unity under his sway, without turning upon his benefactor and without intriguing with the foes of his native land, Murat might be understood and pardoned. Contempt or, at best, pity is, however, the lot of this interesting but puzzling comrade and brother-in-law of the arch-adventurer, Napoleon Bonaparte.

GEORGE M. DUTCHER.

Il Risorgimento Italiano. Conferenze del Prof. COSTANZO RINAUDO.

(Turin: Olivero e C. 1909. Pp. 830.)

THIS may be described as a topical rather than as a narrative history of the Risorgimento. It consists of forty-four lectures delivered by

Professor Rinaudo before the young officers of the Italian War College. Naturally, the requirements of lecturing determined the length and form of the separate chapters. If there are undeniable drawbacks, there are some compensations in the inclusion of several topics which would have been treated very briefly in a narrative history. At times, we have instead of a narrative of action a series of essays—two on Mazzini, for instance, another on Gioberti's political theory, others on the women of the Risorgimento before 1848, and on the political poets. Nor should we omit to mention that the philosophy of the Risorgimento—its aims and factors and the Italian national traditions—are discussed in a section of five introductory lectures. Besides Mazzini and Gioberti, Pius IX., Victor Emanuel, and Cavour are allotted each a chapter for a character-study.

To attempt to analyze such a work in a paragraph would be futile; but it may serve prospective readers to say that they will find Professor Rinaudo a safe guide on nearly all points. He has no marked talent at portraiture, so that we do not bring away from his pages the features of Cavour or Mazzini drawn in master-strokes, but rather a composite of each which everybody can recognize. So too in his discussion of the burning questions over which historians have been debating for half-a-century, we are more likely to get in Rinaudo the resultant of conflicting opinions than a vigorous, convincing verdict of his own. When we remember that these lectures were prepared for the students of the War College, we shall understand why so sober, unpolemical, and conciliatory a historian was chosen for the task. We should not expect that the American Secretary of the Navy would commission a strong partizan of either Sampson or Schley to lecture before the cadets at Annapolis on the battle of Santiago.

It is this moderation which gives Professor Rinaudo's work much of its value; and we can commend it to general readers as being the best account in Italian of the Risorgimento. But the historical student who seeks to know causes will often be disappointed. He would never suspect, for instance, from the professor's two pages (685-686) the proportions or significance of the drama which was enacted between Garibaldi's entry into Naples and his departure for Caprera in the autumn of 1860. Everything is smoothed down; what could not be smoothed down is omitted. And yet even the proficient in the Risorgimento will be grateful to Professor Rinaudo for assembling many stray matters of interest. Especially for the earlier period, which has been less worked, he may be recommended.

His book lacks an index—a lack which should be made a criminal offense in every civilized country. The bibliography of 1000 titles—a large number of which refer to magazine articles—is more than enough for the ordinary reader but too meagre for the specialist. The fact that it includes no English or German titles casts an unpleasant doubt on the range of the author's scholarship.

L'Anima di Francesco Crispi: Carteggio intimo sulla Politica del Risorgimento Italiano. Con Proemio e Note Biografiche di G. PIPITONE-FEDERICO. (Palermo: Ant. Trimarchi. 1910. Pp. lx, 192.)

THE eighty and more, liberally annotated letters which form the contents of this volume are the first important contribution of Crispi's correspondence to be made to the published sources for Italian Risorgimento history. We may look for a goodly number of such volumes in the not distant future; it is a matter of comment that little Crispian literature has been put out since the illustrious Sicilian's death, but in explanation it might be observed that the personal enmities which his vigorous policies and inflexible conduct inspired have not yet sunk into the grave. Eventually we may expect a monumental edition of his collected writings like the editions of Mazzini and Cavour, for without exhaustive research among Crispian sources a complete study of nineteenth-century Italian history will be impossible.

The present letters of Crispi were almost all addressed to Baron Vincenzo Favara of Partanna in the province of Trapani, between 1861 and 1867. Favara, an old republican conspirator, a man of wealth, was a close friend and client of Crispi, and it was to him largely that Crispi owed his first election as Italian deputy from Castelvetro in 1861. The letters are intimate, relate largely to political affairs, and were not intended for the public eye (p. 72). They reveal Crispi's character in what will be to most historians certainly a new light, and they must be regarded as a most valuable source for social and parliamentary conditions during the period of reconstruction, particularly in Sicily.

With the year 1860, which witnessed the expedition of the Thousand and the campaigns of the Marche and the Two Sicilies, the distinctly revolutionary period of the making of Italy had ended. For more than a decade before in Piedmont not only had the government itself followed a revolutionary policy with regard to the rest of Italy, but within its own dominions it had encouraged revolutionary organizations such as the National Society and the Committee of the Fund for the Million Rifles, until it might be said that the revolution personified in Mazzini and Garibaldi had acquired such force and authority as to constitute a state within the state. But when the first Italian parliament was convened in 1861 conditions had changed. Victor Emanuel had annexed all the dominions of the petty despots of Italy; to win the remaining Italian territory, already prepared by the revolution, his final struggle was to be exclusively with foreign powers—with Austria which held the Veneto, and diplomatically with France which was propping up the pope's temporal throne in Rome. The annexation of these provinces must wait; the occasion for it would be offered by the unrest of other powers of Europe, and in the meantime for Italy the dominant issue was reconstruction of the new kingdom and national education. But the revo-

lutionary spirit so thoroughly aroused could not readily recognize the new conditions. That Mazzini and Garibaldi failed to understand them Aspromonte and Mentana bear witness; in fact from 1861 on these illustrious patriots figure as steadfast and stubborn jacobins who had outlived their mission. Crispi on the other hand, though he had been second to none as a jacobin in the past and was still to be found in the militant revolutionary ranks, showed a degree of patience, moderation, and political good judgment that astonished his more impetuous followers and marked in him the statesman. For this period the historian has had little opportunity of examining closely his conduct, but in these letters to Favara many of its outlines appear.

In 1864 Crispi was already recognized as president of the party of the Left and in 1865 he was elected vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies. From the outset in parliament he labored actively in the opposition. As the ministries succeeded one another each seemed to him "more fatal for Italy than its predecessors" (p. 16). "The ministers of the king are ruining the dynasty and preparing for Italy new catastrophes" (p. 70). "But", he declared, "in spite of the errors committed, the prevailing pusillanimity and recriminations, Italy shall be" (p. 47). And it was this indomitable Mazzinian faith in the future of Italy as a great nation to which in no small degree Crispi owed the success of his public career. What Italians needed more than anything else in the periods of reconstruction and national development was a confidence in the destinies of Italy which should enable them to look beyond the party wrongs and the discouragements of the hour and work for the future of the nation. "Ministers go", cried Crispi, "and with them disappear the evils which they have caused. The nation remains, and we should work that it may establish itself and become powerful" (p. 25). Patience and moderation, these are the virtues which he recommends to his own followers of the radical opposition, at the same time that he inveighs against the government in the Chamber. In Sicily there was particular discontent, and agitators clamored, some for secession and some for a republic. Crispi condemned ironically the one and effectively decried the other. "Sicily may commit enormities, but regain autonomy, never" (p. 60). His Mazzinian unitarianism remained always unshaken, but while it excluded from his mind all ideas of secession, it led him logically to forsake the republicanism which he had learned from the same master. His conduct is explained in his famous phrase, "The republic divides us, the monarchy unites us", and having made his decision, monarchist he would remain, "frankly, loyally", he declared to Favara, "so long as the king should be for Italy" (p. 18). Union and concord, these are words which recur repeatedly throughout the letters. "Do not imperil with inaction and discord what we have won at the price of blood" (p. 46). "We must raise the cry of concord, and force both parties to extend hands and embrace. This might be a help to unity, while on the contrary, if the check on passions is left free, we may witness the beginning of a great catastrophe" (p. 56).

Crispi, leader of the radical opposition, was a conservative force in the state, and Italy's debt to him at this period particularly in Sicily is clear, both in the restraint of the insurrectionary tendency and in the promotion of sound parliamentary government.

Crispi's confidence in his own leadership and his independence appear throughout the correspondence. In 1861 he writes, "It is remarkable that my countrymen have realized so late that I am worth something" (p. 6). He does not hesitate to criticize Garibaldi, his old leader, who after 1860 was surrounded by a ring of inferior politicians of the revolution and had lost his good judgment: "It would have been better if Garibaldi had never had the title of deputy. Had he remained a captain he would not have moved from Caprera, and would have been greater and invincible. God has given him neither the mind of Cromwell nor the ambition of Napoleon: captain of the people, his arena is not parliament but the public square and the battle-field" (p. 36).

The volume abounds in open personal criticism and in frank exposition of the writer's views. Until the historian has many more such publications revealing the inner character and purposes of the Italian leaders and people, attempts to write history and biography of the Risorgimento bearing the stamp of finality even in their principal features must be futile.

Pipitone-Federico's preface gives a fair appreciation of the letters, and his notes furnish biographical sketches of the Sicilians mentioned in the letters. But his judgment is highly prejudiced, and he writes without historical method.

H. NELSON GAY.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Bastiaen Jansz. Krol, Krankenbezoeker, Kommies en Kommandeur van Nieuw-Nederland, 1595-1645; Nieuwe Gegevens voor de Vestiging van ons Kerkelijk en Koloniaal Gezag in Noord-Amerika. Door Dr. A. EEKHOF. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1910. Pp. vi, 60, xxxviii.)

THIS biographical account of the first comforter of the sick in New Netherland is the fruit of extensive researches made by Dr. Eekhof at Amsterdam to supplement the historical data which he collected last year in this country, under the auspices of the trustees of the University of Leyden, for a general study of the relations between the Reformed Church in America and the parent church in the Netherlands. The facts, in so far as they are not derived from the *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*, the journal of de Vries, and other well-known sources, are based largely on the records of the Consistory of Amsterdam and are of the utmost importance for a correct view of the establishment of ecclesiastical authority in New Netherland. These records of the Consistory have hitherto not been explored by American writers, owing to the erroneous belief that the Classis of Amsterdam had from the begin-

ning the sole supervision of ecclesiastical affairs in the colonial possessions of the Dutch East and West India Companies. Dr. Eekhof shows that before 1636 the Classis shared this supervision with the Consistory of Amsterdam, who, by order of the Classis, appointed and sent out comforters of the sick and even ordained and sent out ministers, though the latter were examined by the Classis. Hence the necessity of consulting the records of the Consistory, in which Dr. Eekhof discovered the interesting facts that Bastiaen Jansz. Krol visited New Netherland as comforter of the sick in 1624; that Jonas Michaëlius, the first minister of the colony, appeared before the Consistory on March 4, 1632, to give an account of the discharge of his official duties; and that Everardus Bogardus, the second minister, was ordained by the Consistory on July 15, 1632. This date of Krol's first voyage is of particular importance, since it precedes by two years the time when Krol and Jan Huygen were heretofore supposed to have come over and to have first ministered to the spiritual needs of the people on Manhattan Island. In addition to these facts, Dr. Eekhof has gleaned from the city archives and from the notarial archives at Amsterdam a number of personal details about Krol, which are of almost equal interest. Among these may be mentioned the circumstances that the man, who later occupied the post of Director-General of New Netherland, was originally a *caffawerker*, or silk cloth worker by trade, and that in 1615, when he married Annetjen Stoffels-dochter, he could not sign his name. The author has supplied his book with abundant notes and in an appendix has given a digest of the "Copie-boek" of the Consistory, 1589-1635, as well as careful transcripts of all the passages in the records that bear upon his subject. Among the latter is a complete copy of the interrogatory of Krol, June 30, 1634, found in the protocol of notary Justus van de Ven, of which a translation, made from an imperfect copy printed in *Oud Holland*, 1890, appears on pages 203-204 of the *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*. Finally, the book contains photographic reproductions of the most important extracts from the records and a facsimile of a rare map of New Netherland, forming part of a large colored map entitled "Paskaert van Guinea, Brasilien en West Indien", printed by Willem Jansz. Blauw, perhaps before 1621, which was recently sold by Frederik Muller to the Geographical Institute at Utrecht.

A. J. F. v. L.

Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684. Edited by CLAYTON COLMAN HALL, LL.B., A.M., of the Maryland Historical Society. [Original Narratives of Early American History, edited by J. Franklin Jameson.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1910. Pp. ix, 460.)

THE purpose of the *Original Narratives of Early American History* has been abundantly fulfilled in this latest volume of the series, inasmuch as it provides "a comprehensive and well-rounded collection of those narratives which hold an important place as sources" of Maryland history.

A succinct description of the papers will show their nature and value. In regard to the planting of the colony, we have the Account, or prospectus prepared in England in anticipation of the departure of the first colonists; the Instruction of Lord Baltimore for the conduct of the adventurers on shipboard and after their arrival in the new land; Father White's Briefe Relation of the Voyage unto Maryland; and the *Rélation* of 1635, to which are appended the Conditions of Plantation, and the charter granted to Cecilius Calvert.

The reason for selecting the Briefe Relation, instead of the *Relatio Itineris*, is given (p. 28); perhaps a translation of the Latin account, such as was edited by Dr. Dalrymple for the Maryland Historical Society, would have been more acceptable, as it gives fuller details of the incidents of the voyage and the founding of St. Mary's, and manifests more clearly the charming simplicity and piety of the "Apostle of Maryland".

The introduction to the *Relation* of 1635 condenses much information concerning the charter into a concise and erudite statement. It may be said of all Mr. Hall's explanatory introductions that they are exact and luminous in regard to the author of the paper, the circumstances of its origin, and the bibliography relating to it. The comments which are added are necessary, or useful, to elucidate the subject-matter.

Several of the documents in this volume refer to the controversy between Lord Baltimore and William Claiborne; others present the conflicting testimony concerning the battle of the Severn; whilst others deal with the boundary disputes between Pennsylvania and Maryland.

The editor refrains from pronouncing judgment on controverted points, contenting himself with "a brief statement of the grounds of dispute" (p. 50), and declaring that "it has been sought to point out in foot-notes where the zeal of controversy has gone to the extent of coloring facts or of so presenting them as to cause misapprehension." These foot-notes are brief, but apposite and sufficient.

In accordance with this plan, the narrators speak for their own side of the question. The juxtaposition of *Babylon's Fall* and *The Refutation of Babylon's Fall* throws into vivid contrast the perfervid utterances of a religious zealot and the trenchant logic of a legal mind. A lucid declaration of the boundary dispute is prefixed to the Conferences between Lord Baltimore and William Penn, and their Agents; the documents limn forth the salient traits of character of the participants; and the dialogue between Penn and Colonel Talbot surpasses any mere description in portraying the bland diplomatic astuteness of the proprietary of Pennsylvania and the single-minded loyalty to his patron and that patron's cause on the part of the impetuous Irishman.

The Journals of Augustine Herrman and George Fox, besides their intrinsic interest, will be valuable to the historian, the geographer, and the genealogist. The carefully prepared index will be helpful for research and reference.

EDWARD I. DEVITT, S. J.

New Relation of Gaspesia, with the Customs and Religion of the Gaspesian Indians. By FATHER CHRESTIEN LE CLERCQ. Translated and edited, with a reprint of the original, by WILLIAM F. GANONG, Ph.D., Professor in Smith College. [The Publications of the Champlain Society.] (Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1910. Pp. xv, 452.)

IN this well-printed volume Professor Ganong furnishes a reprint *verbatim et literatim* of the 1691 edition of the *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie* of Father le Clercq and a good English translation retaining as much as possible the flavor of the original without loss of clearness and intelligibility. The introduction (pp. 1-41) gives all that is known of the author and the genesis of his historical labors. At pages 42-46 is a "Bibliographical Description", from which we learn that the issue of 1758 "is a publisher's 'trick', and the title is a curiosity", this on the authority of Mr. V. H. Paltsits, who contributes this section of the book. The abundant and scholarly foot-notes contain much real and useful information (geographical, ethnological, linguistic, and historical), satisfactory interpretations being here offered for the first time for not a few of the Micmac terms scattered throughout Father le Clercq's pages—the task would have been easier, did we possess his *Dictionary of the Gaspesian Language*, which the good priest said he left at the Monastery of Notre Dame des Anges, in Quebec, but which seems to have gone quite astray. The absence of a bibliography of Father le Clercq and his work is due to "sundry practical reasons", leading to the distribution of such material throughout the foot-notes, the citation of authors and works in the index making up largely for this treatment.

An "almost microscopic study" of the work of Father le Clercq has enabled Professor Ganong to correct some minor errors in the data concerning him in the publications of Harrisse, Shea, etc., as well as to determine more accurately some of his movements, although a gap for the years 1684-1686 is still to be accounted for. His use of material from Father le Jeune's *Relation* of 1634 is pointed out; also the probable influence of Father le Caron, Denys, etc. Professor Ganong's estimate of the place and value of Father le Clercq's work is on the whole just, as is likewise his opinion of the author's trustworthiness on all matters of prime importance treated in the *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*.

Among the illustrations of special interest are a copy of the long-lost map (1685) of Father Jumeau, friend and colleague of Father le Clercq, photographed from the original in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, a map which goes with the book "as perfectly as if he himself had drawn it for the express purpose"; and the reproductions of four pen-drawings (one representing Indians learning to read the "Micmac hieroglyphics"), dating from the end of the seventeenth century, found inserted in a beautiful copy of the rare issue of 1692 of the *Nouvelle Relation* now in the possession of Mr. F. L. Gay. These drawing may be by Father le Clercq himself, or, possibly by Father Jumeau, in which latter case, the priest

in the first picture is perhaps Father le Clercq himself, as Professor Ganong suggests.

The famous "Micmac hieroglyphs" are discussed on pages 21-32, and the modern characters now in use are shown to be identical with those of the Abbé Maillard (middle of the eighteenth century). Professor Ganong gives good reasons for believing that Abbé Maillard adapted and improved upon the system of Father le Clercq, which he found still in use, and was not, as has been generally supposed, the inventor of these curious "hieroglyphics". The characters on the tablet in the picture just referred to seem to settle this point.

The question of the "worship of the cross", attributed by Father le Clercq to the Indians of Miramichi, is also discussed by Professor Ganong, who reaches the entirely reasonable conclusion (p. 40) that we have here "a sub-tribal totem sign, originally the conventionalized figure of some animal, later modified, whether consciously or deliberately, under the influence of Christian teachings". Professor Ganong is quite right in rejecting (p. 180) the etymologies so far offered for "Miramichi", though it may be a mistake to regard the word as non-Indian altogether. The suggestion, made in a foot-note to page 123, that the making of maple sugar, though of Indian origin, is not prehistoric but began about 1675, is worth considering. Altogether, Professor Ganong may be said to have done his work as editor well and to have added something new to the literature of the matters dealt with.

ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN.

A Documentary History of American Industrial Society. Edited by JOHN R. COMMONS, ULRICH B. PHILLIPS, EUGENE A. GILMORE, HELEN L. SUMNER, and JOHN B. ANDREWS. Prepared under the auspices of the American Bureau of Industrial Research, with the co-operation of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. With preface by RICHARD T. ELY and introduction by JOHN B. CLARK. Volumes V. and VI. *Labor Movement, 1820-1840.* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1910. Pp. 392; 353.)

THESE two volumes of the *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* cover a highly interesting period in the history of the American labor movement. All the works on American labor history, as well as the general historical works dealing with the period, give brief accounts of a labor movement from 1827 to 1837, but our knowledge of this movement has hitherto been of the scantiest kind. The present work makes available important sources of information which have been hitherto almost entirely unexploited. The sources thus drawn upon are chiefly the newspapers published during the period in the interest of the organized laborers—*e. g.*, *The Man*, *the National Laborer*, and the *National Trades' Union*. These newspapers were edited by the labor leaders of the time and contain a fund of news concerning the move-

ment. Naturally, there are many gaps in material of this character but the editors by diligent and wide search have been able to piece together a comprehensive and highly satisfactory account.

The new material thus assembled throws much light on the aims of the movement. Our information on this point has heretofore been confined practically to bare lists of the demands formulated by the workingmen's conventions. By the aid of the documents here presented it is possible to weigh the relative importance of these demands in the minds of the workingmen of the period. It becomes clear, for instance, that the demand for education at public cost was more persistently pressed and probably exerted a greater influence on the establishment of free schools than has been supposed. Also, the complicated political workingmen's movements in New York in 1829-1831, which have heretofore baffled explanation, become intelligible.

More important still is the revelation of the character of the organization which stood behind the movement of 1833-1837. The proceedings of the Philadelphia, New York, and other trades unions show a degree and extent of organization hitherto unsuspected. The excerpts from *The Man* and the *National Trades' Union* here printed contain the constitution and the greater part of the minutes of the New York General Trades Union from 1833 to 1836. This body, composed at the height of its strength of delegates from a large number of trade societies, levied taxes upon its constituent societies; authorized strikes of individual societies for the redress of various grievances, and supported these strikes from its treasury. Similar but less detailed information is given concerning the Philadelphia and other trades unions. The proceedings of the National Trades Union, composed of local trades unions, which existed from 1834 to 1837, and which has hitherto been little more than a name in the history of the American labor movement, have been rescued from buried newspaper files and reprinted in great fullness.

To the student of the evolution of trade unionism, the present volumes are of the highest interest since the period from 1827 to 1837 is shown to be characterized by the dominance of a form of trades-union organization—the central labor union or as it was then known the trades union, or union of trade societies in a city—which has since occupied a subordinate place in the organization of labor. The editors make out a strong case for their contention that the trades-union form of organization was developed at least as early in the United States as in England. In any event it is clear that at no time in England has the trades-union movement been centred so largely about the central labor union as it was in the United States from 1833 to 1837.

The documents are arranged into groups according as they relate to various organizations, *e. g.*, Mechanics Union of Trade Association and the Philadelphia Political Movement, the National Trades Union, etc., and to each group is prefixed a brief but adequate introduction. In addition, there is a general introduction to the two volumes in which the causes of the movement are discussed. The volumes unquestionably

make a permanently important contribution to the history of the labor movement in the United States.

GEORGE E. BARNETT.

The Diary of James K. Polk during his Presidency, 1845 to 1849.

Now first printed from the original manuscript in the collections of the Chicago Historical Society. Edited and annotated by MILO MILTON QUAIFFE, Assistant Professor in the Lewis Institute of Technology, with an introduction by ANDREW CUNNINGHAM McLAUGHLIN, Head of the Department of History of the University of Chicago. In four volumes. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company. 1910. Pp. xxxii, 498; 494; 508; 462.)

THE voluminous diary of President Polk owed its origin, we are told, to "a very important conversation" between Polk and his Secretary of State, Buchanan, at a Cabinet meeting August 26, 1845, on the Oregon question. Polk insisted upon the line $54^{\circ}40'$, while Buchanan was equally strenuous for the line 49° . Buchanan was overruled, but the despatch which he was obliged to write to Pakenham was magnanimously characterized by Polk as "admirable". So important did Polk regard the incident that he forthwith wrote out an account of it for future reference, and thereafter, until June 2, 1849, two weeks before his death, kept a daily record of his public life. It is in every way an extraordinary record and an historical document of the utmost importance. That Polk could find time or strength, in the momentous years of his presidency, to set down such full and detailed accounts of his varied occupations, testifies to rare persistence and strength of will.

Only an extended review could possibly take account of all the notable matters to which the diary refers, or enumerate the controversies on which it sheds light. Of no other administration, save that of John Quincy Adams, have we so full a record from the President's standpoint. Here is unfolded, for example, the history of a cabinet during nearly four eventful years; and Cabinet proceedings, even in these days of newspaper publicity, are a little known part of American history. Polk was the undoubted ruler of his Cabinet; and though he consulted his advisers on all occasions, he enunciated his own views with distinctness, insisted upon obedience, and had his own way in the end. Towards the end of his term, he tells us (September 23, 1848), he had so far familiarized himself with departmental details as to need advice only on "a great measure or a new question"; and he never called for opinions in writing, believing that harmony was best insured when members talked face to face. He was impatient of delay or inefficiency in departmental business, and more than once called his Cabinet sharply to account; the War Department particularly was in bad condition, and the State Department a source of annoying political leakage and covert opposition. He did not have an entirely harmonious political family of course, and had at times to suffer something strongly suggestive of disrespect; but

he seems to have kept his temper and with dignified insistence made his will prevail.

The bane of his life, however, was not a hard-bitted cabinet, nor yet such great national questions as Oregon, Mexico, or the Wilmot proviso, but the unending horde of office-seekers. Not a week passes without a scathing denunciation of the crowd of "patriots" who haunted the White House, hung about the door of his office, forced themselves into his presence on any and every occasion, and besought him for offices just vacated, or to be vacated, or already satisfactorily filled, or yet to be created. No official could fall seriously ill without precipitating applications for his place in case he should die. The list of beggars comprised every grade of ability and character, from Benton and Charles J. Ingersoll to rakes, adventurers, party hacks, and political schemers. Among the most persistent visitors were women, for whose political activity Polk had special aversion. Until after the Barnburners' Convention in New York, in 1848, when some of the Van Buren Democrats began to work openly against him, he struggled to treat all factions in the Democratic party alike, incurring the enmity of Buchanan by his course; but for the whole business of patronage he shows increasingly angry dislike, and his diary fairly exhausts the vocabulary of expletive and denunciation.

The origin of Polk's war message of May 11, 1846, has been told by Mr. Schouler, who used the Bancroft transcript of the diary, in his essay on "President Polk's Administration". The question of moral responsibility involved is, perhaps, one of opinion and emphasis, but it may at least be doubted whether Polk's daily record, taken as a whole, does not give his case a somewhat more favorable aspect than is given it in Mr. Schouler's essay. So far as members of the Cabinet and some of his political intimates were concerned, Polk had made no secret of his purpose to acquire from Mexico, by purchase, a considerable territory. The war message, rapidly as it was written, seems to have been some days in mind. On April 25, in laying before the Cabinet the matter of our relations with Mexico, Polk was for "a bold and firm course"; while Buchanan recommended a declaration of war, and the other members, without dissenting, agreed that a message ought to be prepared in the course of the next week. Thereupon Polk "stated the points which should be presented in the message" and asked Buchanan to prepare the draft from materials in his department. Three days later the question was again taken up, with the same conclusion and the same request to Buchanan. On Sunday, May 3, Polk sent for Benton, told him that "we had ample cause of war", and that while he would delay until the arrival of Slidell, who was daily expected, a message would be sent in before the close of the session. Benton was averse to war if it could honorably be avoided, but was promised a sight of the message before it was transmitted. On the 5th and 6th the Cabinet again discussed the Mexican situation, and the 7th was mainly occupied by Polk "in examining the present state of our relations with Mexico, with a view to make

a communication on the subject to Congress". On Friday, the 8th, Slidell arrived, had an hour's conference with Polk, and urged that the United States should now take the redress of grievances into its own hands. At the Cabinet meeting the next day, when the subject was "very fully discussed", all agreed that any hostile act by the Mexicans at Matamoros ought at once to be followed by a war message. Polk, however, went further, recommending "definitive measures", reiterating his opinion that the United States had ample justification for war, and giving it as his opinion that a message should be ready by Tuesday. To the latter point the Cabinet, when questioned, agreed, except Bancroft, who wished to withhold the message until some act of hostility had been committed. The relevant correspondence in the War and State Departments was directed to be copied for submission with the message. Then, in the evening, came the news of the collision on the Rio Grande, and the preparation of the message over Sunday proceeded as described by Mr. Schouler.

In the light of this procession of events, however, it seems hardly correct to say, as Mr. Schouler does, that on May 9 Polk "took up a war policy", when the question had been before the Cabinet almost daily for two weeks, and when Polk himself had already spent nearly a whole day in preparation for a message already practically decided upon. The criticism of Polk for not taking time to look over the transcribed correspondence, although he had read the originals, seems also somewhat overstrained; must a President personally verify the work of a departmental copyist?

Among the many "mean expedients . . . for heading off public opinion in the unhappy republic whose patriotism thwarted us", Mr. Schouler, in the same essay, refers to the employment of Roman Catholic priests to accompany the army, "not as chaplains", but "because they spoke the Mexican language" and might "undeceive" the adversary. What Polk did, according to the diary, was to solicit the aid of Bishop (afterwards Archbishop) Hughes of New York in securing some priests from the United States who knew Spanish to accompany the army "as chaplains and others", for the purpose of assuring the Mexican clergy that their religion and church property were not to be interfered with by the American invasion. Later (October 14, 1846), in an interview with the Rev. William L. McCalla, an applicant for a chaplaincy in the army, Polk stated that Mexico being a Catholic country and the priests having great influence over their ignorant people, "they would probably deceive them by representing that the United States was waging war against them to overturn their religion"; with the result that a desperate and sanguinary resistance would be offered. It was to "undeceive" them on this point that Spanish-speaking priests were used; not, indeed, as chaplains, because Polk found that there was no law authorizing such appointments, but as army employes.

Enough has been said to indicate how many are the points which may well be re-examined in the light of this invaluable record. Pro-

fessor Quaife prints the diary in full, but with modernized punctuation and uniform date-headings for the daily entries. Occasional omissions in the text are supplied in brackets, and a few incomplete or obscure expressions are similarly elucidated. The notes are confined to personalia and brief historical summaries. The editor also supplies a short biographical sketch of Polk, and Professor A. C. McLaughlin contributes an introduction. It is greatly to be regretted that the index, so supremely important in a work of this character, contains but incomplete reference to the names which crowd the text.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

A Congressional History of Railways in the United States. By LEWIS H. HANEY, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Acting Head of the Department of Economics in the University of Texas. Volume II. *The Railway and Congress, 1850-1887.* (Madison, Wis.: Democrat Printing Company. 1910. Pp. 335.)

THE relation which the several departments of the federal government hold to the railways of our country is the result of a gradual evolution extending over a period of practically eighty years. The impelling force of this evolution has been the public mind working through the activities of Congress.

In a previous volume the author has traced the development of this relation to the end of the first half of the last century. In the volume under review this work is carried forward to the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887.

As stated by the author the book is "a history of action and reaction between railways and the government" and aims to present "an accurate and intelligible account of Congress' various railway experiences".

The subject is treated under the two general heads, Aid and Regulation. Under the first are discussed the various forms of aid, such as land grants, the reduction of duties on railway supplies, extension of credit on duties, the guarantee of bond interest, and subsidies requested of or granted by Congress for the construction of railways in undeveloped sections of the country. Under the second head the author develops first the earlier manifestations of railway regulation and restriction based, for the most part, on the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution to provide for the public defense, to levy taxes, and to provide post-roads; and second, the development of regulation based directly on the power conferred on Congress by the "commerce clause" of the Constitution.

It is impossible in a short review to do more than express a few generalizations. The author has collected a large amount of important information from the volumes of the *Congressional Globe* and *Record*, which is practically inaccessible to the average reader, and has presented this information in such a manner as to give an intelligible account of the relation of Congress to the growth of our present-day

railway systems. Among the most important points which have been treated are: the development of the plans and the determination of the location of the Pacific railways; the extension of governmental regulation to the railways in the efforts to provide for the public defense and the transportation of the mails; the breaking up of state monopolies of transportation formed to protect local markets; the effect of the Granger movement on the furtherance of rate regulation; and the gradual growth of the idea of the public character of railways and their inclusion under the provisions of the "commerce clause" through the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887.

It is likely that one of the most important services rendered by this work will be to dissipate the fallacy that the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, based primarily on the "commerce clause", was a radical departure from previous ideas of regulation. The discussions over the transcontinental railway problems; the passage, in 1865, of a bill to facilitate communication among the states; the many and heated debates in Congress respecting the propriety of including railways under the "commerce clause", thereby providing regulation of interstate transportation; the control of bridges across navigable streams; the provisions for the safety of passengers; the regulation of the live-stock traffic; and finally the Granger agitation, were all factors which, extending over more than a quarter of a century, paved the way for and led to the more general and comprehensive regulation contained in the Interstate Commerce Act. This gradual evolution of the spirit of regulation, culminating in the act, has been recognized by the author and appropriately treated.

The volume is a painstaking and thorough piece of investigation. It is perhaps open to the criticism that it places too great emphasis on minor details and is too decided in respect to certain economic conclusions. To the student of modern transportation problems, especially that phase of the problem that has to do with the rapidly developing tendency toward administrative supervision, this work of Dr. Haney is of the highest importance. It gives an insight into the many problems which hold so prominent a place in our social, political, and economic life, and will be of material aid in dealing with these problems.

HENRY C. ADAMS.

The American Civil War: a Concise History of its Causes, Progress, and Results. By JOHN FORMBY. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1910. Pp. xvii, 520.)

THE object of this book is to give a short and connected account of the Civil War and of the events which led up to it, "the lack of which seems to have acted as a deterrent to the study of a most useful and interesting episode of history". "The American Civil War", he says, "seems at first such a tangle of disconnected details, spread over so vast an extent of country, that the reader soon gets bewildered and is

apt to study one part to the neglect of another." The plan is to give a short synopsis from which details are eliminated.

In the introduction the author gives a very short summary of the whole course of the war. In the first three chapters he narrates the events that led up to Secession, beginning at the year 1790. He recognizes that the two great interests of the nation were those of the traders and manufacturers on the one side, and of the planters on the other, and that slavery came into the quarrel merely as the supposed backbone of the planter party. In the next chapter he gives a short account of Secession; then in nine chapters a synopsis of all the operations, even those of minor importance, for he says, "almost all of them had a direct effect on the main phase of the War in the district for the time being." At the end of each chapter is a chronological table of two or three pages, showing at a glance the principal events of each month in the East, Southeast, West, Southwest, and naval regions respectively. Then in a short chapter, he explains the End of the Mexican Complication. For he says that sufficient attention has not been given "to the distracting effect of the operations of Napoleon III. in Mexico". In the last three chapters he deals with Reconstruction, Some Actors in the War, and Results and Lessons of the War. Foot-notes throughout the narrative call attention to synchronous events in the different theatres of operation.

The author's view with regard to the general progress of the war appears to be that generally approved by those who have carefully studied it. It is unfortunate that he was not sufficiently familiar with the history of the war to avoid several errors in describing the operations. These errors do not materially injure the book as a synopsis, but his military criticisms and statements of detail must be taken with caution.

The book is accompanied by sixty-five maps bound in a separate volume. The first shows the general features of the seat of war, rivers, mountain ranges, railroads, etc. The next four on a smaller scale show the limit of Union control at the end of each year from 1861 to 1864 inclusive. The next two—the Blockade, and the High Seas—show the scenes of the most important naval events of the war. The other maps are mere outlines which appear to show the location of all points mentioned in the text, unincumbered with unnecessary details.

Such a complete synopsis as this book with its maps affords, will be of great use. It will enable the casual reader of parts of the Civil War history to understand the relation of what he reads to the other events of the war, and help the professional student to co-ordinate and compare the operations conducted in different fields at the same time, and in the same field from the beginning to the end of the war.

The Campaign of Chancellorsville: a Strategic and Tactical Study.

By JOHN BIGELOW, Jr., Major U. S. Army, retired. (New Haven: Yale University Press. Pp. xvi, 528.)

IN a monumental work of more than five hundred pages Major John Bigelow has shown that too much cannot be said on a great theme and that it is never too late to undertake it. Many good books have dealt with Chancellorsville and told the sad story of a great, brave, and undismayed army which was foiled and disastrously beaten by a force of half its size and driven back to its camps. So much has been written that it almost seemed that the subject was exhausted, and that it had passed into the realm of ancient history. If such was ever likely to occur, the story has been happily resurrected by Major Bigelow, who has also brought out much new matter and woven the tangled threads again into heroic form. The professional student, whose judgment is often warped by enthusiasm for details of strategy and tactics, may possibly be wide of the mark when he predicts the fate of any book of historical or technical character, but he may safely recommend the *Campaign of Chancellorsville* as containing enough of tragedy and comedy to satisfy those who seek for lighter reading.

The author follows correct models of historical and professional narratives, at times approaching brilliancy in his method of grouping facts and conclusions. Criticism is modest throughout, never extravagant in praise, or over-mild in censure, but rather leaving the judgment of events to the reader himself. Very satisfactory is the method of giving "the mental point of view and field of vision of the opposing commanders" in order that the reader may keep informed "as to how much or how little each commander knew about the tactical and strategic situation". Instead of viewing the campaign from the vantage-point of time and years of study, we are given numerous citations and references to the statements of the actors themselves.

In this generation we cease to feel an interest in *what* our fathers fought about in the Civil War, but we are quite keen to know *how* they fought. We need no better example than this. The recital loses nothing of interest because we see, overshadowing it all, the majestic forms of Lee and Jackson. It fires us with Anglo-Saxon pride of race and strengthens the hope that the country may continue to breed such men for the battles yet to come.

History and biography and criticism in military matters usually delight to contemplate the roar of artillery and leaden hail of infantry bullets, with attendant carnage of blood and suffering. But there is much more to a campaign, as Major Bigelow well demonstrates, that is of just as absorbing interest. This is particularly noticeable in the attention given to cavalry operations. Cavalry leadership was perhaps no better or worse than the leadership of other arms, but cavalry action was generally overshadowed by the dramatic collision of forces ten times more numerous. We here find all kinds of examples of cavalry

action, strategical and tactical, good and bad. Referring only to the good, we find few better than Fitz-Hugh Lee's reconnaissance to Hartwood Church, W. E. Jones's operations with 2000 cavalry against the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, guarded by 34,000 men present for duty, Harrison with thirty men at Fleming's Cross Roads, McVickar at Alsop's Farm. Perhaps the author is rather hard on Lieutenant-Colonel John S. Mosby in his discussion of that officer's military status. Mosby had enthusiastic approval of such high-toned soldiers as Lee and Stuart, not to speak of U. S. Grant and his opponent in Loudoun County, General Charles Russell Lowell, who wrote to his wife, "Mosby is an honorable foe and should be treated as such." The cavalry actions at Miskell's Farm, Thompson's Corner, Aldie, Dranesville, Herndon Station, as described in this book, had no characteristic of guerrilla action and might serve to-day to teach a lesson to cavalry.

The greatest fault in military historical works written in this country is the worthless maps. The author has helped us greatly by his forty-seven maps, sketches, and plans in colors, showing the positions of troops at successive stages of operations described. It is suggested that, as the woods exert such an influence on every phase of the conflict, an additional color to show wooded areas would have greatly improved the general value of the work. EBEN SWIFT.

Reconstruction in Texas. By CHARLES WILLIAM RAMSDELL, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XXXVI., no. 1.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1910. Pp. 324.)

THE last few years have brought forth numerous studies in the Reconstruction period of our history. Among these, hardly is there a better than that of Professor Ramsdell's *Reconstruction in Texas*. Dr. Ramsdell has had unusual advantages in the matter of access to original sources. He had at his service the Executive Correspondence of the state, which included a large number of letters from governors in their official capacity; its Reconstruction Correspondence, which embodied a great many letters from army officers and from the Freedmen's Bureau; its Executive Records, which contained proclamations and letters from other departments of the government, including the letter-book of the secretary of state; the Johnson Papers in the Library of Congress; and the Roberts Papers. Besides these sources he availed himself of the files of practically all the newspapers published contemporaneously in the state. He also had access to certain books and periodicals, public documents and pamphlets, not usually available.

Dr. Ramsdell leads up to his work with true insight by dealing with conditions in the state prior to the outbreak of the war, and emphasizes the unique position held by Texas throughout the bitter struggle; certain distinct problems were presented in her reconstruction, which were not common in other of the Confederate States. He shows that on ac-

count of the fact that the negro population was not so large as in some of the other states and was concentrated in the eastern part, the influence of the Freedmen's Bureau was much diminished; and further, that the situation was complicated because of hostile Indians, lack of railway transportation, etc.

Special attention has been given to the relations of the state officials and military commanders, and the writer has shown Sheridan's shortcomings in unmincing words. From 1867 he has given his attention largely to political matters, making particularly clear the struggle between the Radicals or Republicans, and the split into the Jack Hamilton and Davis factions. He has carefully shown the reasons for the final overthrow of the Davis government, after the readmission of the state.

There is a palpable lack of economical and social discussion in the book, which, Dr. Ramsdell himself explains, came about through failure to find such material. It might be said in extenuation that such information is extremely difficult to discover. Again, the economic history of the period is less complicated than in most of the other Southern States on account of the fact that there were no confiscated plantations, fewer negroes, fewer carpet-baggers, and the Radicals themselves were mostly Texans.

Professor Ramsdell has indicated pointedly the great service rendered by Throckmorton, and we are glad this patriotic Texan is thus honored. He has dealt in a searching and judicious way with his characters, being extremely temperate in his expressions. The style of his writing is agreeable. Here and there, it is barely possible that condensations might have been made to advantage. On the whole the work is a valuable addition to our studies in general of Reconstruction.

W. F. McCaleb.

A History of California Labor Legislation. With an Introductory Sketch of the San Francisco Labor Movement. By LUCILE EAVES, Associate Professor of Practical Sociology at the University of Nebraska. (Berkeley: University Press. 1910. Pp. xiv, 461.)

THIS elaborate monograph is a sane and scholarly discussion of the many-sided problem whose right solution more and more urgently challenges the earnest effort of the American people. It is a model piece of scientific work. It displays an insight and a breadth of treatment which attest the unique equipment of Dr. Eaves for the performance of her difficult task. To it she brings not merely the skill of the expert in history and economics, but also the sympathy and the intimacy of knowledge which could come only from her eight years of social service leadership in San Francisco. Hence the labor legislation in California is treated as a part of the whole movement of organized labor in the United States. True, the conditions of labor in California in some respects have always been unique, and hence its history is singularly dra-

matic. Nevertheless, that history may be thoroughly understood only in the light of the whole national history. No doubt the author's hope will be realized that "this study might prove a modest contribution towards a better understanding of some of those subtler problems of social and economic development that must occupy the future students of American history."

This is not a legislative history in the narrow sense. It is no barren synopsis of laws. Dr. Eaves has "regarded legal enactments as but the final expression of the demands of the wage-workers of the state at different periods in its economic development". Therefore she has traced the "circumstances giving rise to these demands, and also the social forces making possible the passage of the proposed measures", and reviewed the "court decisions by which the labor laws have been interpreted and fitted into the existing legal system". Indeed, one is impressed by the mass of original and other materials described in the formal bibliography and conscientiously used in the text, as the very numerous foot-notes bear witness. The Index of Cases, for instance, shows that more than 250 court decisions have been analyzed; while practically the whole output of the California press from the "gold" days onward has been explored.

In the narrow space assigned to this notice detailed analysis is impossible. The text consists of twenty chapters covering every important phase of the subject. The first chapter (pp. 1-81) on the San Francisco Labor Movement, in view of the leadership of the metropolis, is of special interest. Three luminous chapters are devoted to the exclusion and regulation of the Chinese. It is shown conclusively that the California policy is the result of social experience; that it is sustained by public sentiment. Its motives are only in part economic. "The legislation excluding the Chinese is the product of many years of determined effort on the part of the working men of California backed by the full force of the American labor movement." Of scarcely less general interest is the careful chapter on Judicial Restraint of the Actions of Trade-Unions. Never has the tragic story of the throttling of social liberty by judicial legalism been more graphically told.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

History of Washington: the Rise and Progress of an American State. By CLINTON A. SNOWDEN. In four volumes. (New York: The Century History Company. 1909. Pp. xxi, 497; xv, 509; xv, 519; xv, 467.)

THIS is a large work but unfortunately it deserves but little attention at the hands of serious historians. It bears every evidence, but one, of having been conceived and executed for the purpose of reaping a harvest by the hackneyed subscription method at twenty-five dollars a set. The one missing piece of evidence is the collection of paid-for biographies and there are rumors of a forthcoming volume or two of those.

The books are six and one-half by nine and three-quarters inches. There are generous margins, the print being four by six and five-eighths inches. The type is large and clear, the paper, a heavy "egg-shell", gilt top but edges otherwise uncut. In the four volumes there are 2047 pages. The binding is a rich marbled board with three-quarters red leather stamped in gold, including the seal of the state on each volume. There are one hundred and twenty-one illustrations on paper in imitation of parchment. Many of these are rare and in years to come this collection of pictures will give the volumes their greatest value.

On the title-page appear the names of four estimable citizens of the state—Cornelius H. Hanford, United States district judge; Miles C. Moore, former governor; William D. Tyler, former legislator; Stephen J. Chadwick, justice of the State Supreme Court. These are called "Advisory Editors". The author in his preface says they all manifested "a helpful interest in the work" and that Judge Hanford was of particular service with his advice and encouragement. Without questioning in the least the sincerity of these good men in permitting the use of their names in this instance, it is perfectly well known to all familiar with history enterprises in the newer western states that boards of editors are more serviceable to the solicitors of subscriptions than to the author of the work.

The dedication reads: "To my mother and the memory of my father. They were pioneers." It is clear that Mr. Snowden approached his task with complete sincerity and there is abundant evidence that he gave to it the best efforts within his limitations. There are many reasons why the present writer would like to lavish praise and nothing else upon these volumes, but this review is written within and for the guild of historians and here the invariable rule is a strict and honest frankness.

The fault of this *History of Washington* is that Mr. Snowden, the author, is in no sense a trained historian. One of the first great essentials, that of a proper perspective, is woefully neglected. Here are four large volumes devoted to "The Rise and Progress of an American State" and yet of the more than two thousand pages but a meagre span of eight pages are devoted to the period of statehood. Washington Territory had an existence covering thirty-six years, from 1853 to 1889. Up to the date of publishing this history there had passed twenty-one years of statehood. In politics, industries, literature, art, road-building, general development, in all that makes history worth while, those twenty-one years of statehood were by far richer and fuller than the three dozen years of territorial times. But the records of the more recent years are much more difficult to write. The multitudes of materials require a vast labor in their collection, assortment, selection, condensation, and writing. If it be said that those years are too recent for the historian, then these four volumes should not carry across each pair of pages "The Rise and Progress of an American State". It would be more honest to call the work a history of Washington Territory.

Another evidence of the author's lack of training is his misuse of bibliography. In the four volumes there are one hundred and ninety-six foot-notes. Scarcely one of them, where reference to a source is to be indicated, complies with the rudiments of the science of history. At the end of volume I. is given an affidavit by Charles Bulfinch on the discovery and first occupation of Columbia River. No indication is given as to the source of the document. There are the same omissions from the two appendixes of volume II. and the four in volume III. On page 470 of volume II. is a foot-note saying: "The references in this and the two following chapters, where the date only is given at the bottom of the page, are to a series of articles written by the old settlers, and published in the Tacoma Sunday *Ledger*, in the years 1892 and 1893." That note must be carried in the reader's mind to make intelligible a long series of simple dates at the bottom of following pages. Frequently long quotations are made with no indication of the source. One example is in volume II., on page 314 and occasionally on the following pages, "Mrs. Pringle—who was Catherine Sager—says". She is giving important testimony on the Whitman massacre but when, where, or how she said those things does not appear. In a similar way Mackenzie "says" a page in quotations on pages 230-231 of volume I. and Fraser does the same thing on page 233 of the same volume. The volumes are full of such lapses. In volume II., page 427, a foot-note endeavors to explain the few months' difference that would mean Jackson or Simmons as the first American settler in the territory and yet the explaining note makes the year 1845 read 1854.

In explaining how Whitman could not have given information to President Tyler and Secretary Webster, volume II., pages 149-150, the author overlooks the well-known letter by Whitman to Secretary of War Porter which begins: "In compliance with the request you did me the honor to make last winter while at Washington". Likewise on page 101 of the same volume the author overlooks the testimony of Daniel Lee, who, with J. H. Frost, published *Ten Years in Oregon* in 1845. A careful comparison of these four volumes with the sources would probably yield a harvest gratifying to a faultfinder. The present reviewer has no desire to play that rôle. Enough has been said to show that Mr. Snowden has industriously and sincerely gathered a vast amount of the records prior to and during the territorial existence of Washington and that the same has been beautifully published in four elaborate volumes to be paid for at a high price by subscribers.

EDMOND S. MEANY.

Wool-Growing and the Tariff: a Study in the Economic History of the United States. By CHESTER WHITNEY WRIGHT, Ph.D. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. V.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1910. Pp. xiii, 362.)

THE thesis of this important contribution to American economic literature is that the tariff on imports, whether of wool or of manufac-

tures of wool, has had an insignificant effect in encouraging, that is to say, causing an increase of, wool-growing as an industry in the United States. Whether the author has or has not proved the point, no one, whatever may be his opinion, will withhold from him the most unreserved admiration of the thoroughness of his study and the fullness of the facts and statistics essential to the argument and the conclusion. The monograph is therefore a model for works of this kind, inasmuch as, although the author makes his own deduction from the facts presented, he has presented all the facts in the case, and thus enables others to draw opposite conclusions—if they can. Nothing is suppressed.

It follows from that statement that we have here a complete and final history of wool-growing in the United States—its origin, its growth, its transfer, sometimes gradual and sometimes rapid, from one region to another and the apparent causes of such transfer, the range of prices of wool during the whole period of the history of the industry, the comparative remuneration of the wool-growers, the relation of imports of wool to the importation of manufactures of wool—these, and all kindred facts, compiled with the most painstaking care and industry, and set forth in logical and lucid sequence. It is that which makes the work useful, indispensable, not only to all who would study the great economic question here discussed, but to every man also who is interested in a large way either in sheep husbandry or in the manufacture of wool.

Shall we not say that this is its only usefulness? May it not be predicted with absolute confidence that as a thesis it will have little or no effect upon public opinion or upon legislation? The reasons for holding that opinion may be stated in a few words. The wool-grower might admit that the tariff has had no tendency whatsoever to increase the quantity of American wool produced—Mr. Wright does not go quite so far as that—and yet he would maintain, and Mr. Wright concedes, that the tariff has benefited him somewhat in the matter of price, which is what concerns him. The manufacturer, who feels unable to compete with the foreigner without protection by import duties, might agree that neither in quantity nor in price is the wool-grower benefited by the tariff, yet he cannot claim protection for himself and deny it to the wool-grower, if the wool-grower deems it necessary. Protectionists generally are agreed that no class of manufactures more needs the help of the tariff—they may differ as to the amount of help needed—than those which make use of wool; and they favor a duty on wool merely as a matter of consistency, if for no other reason. Free traders are already convinced, and Mr. Wright's treatise simply confirms fixed opinions.

Nevertheless, we have already reached a point in American industrial development where the tariff is becoming less and less important and protection less and less necessary. One after another of our industries will cease to need the help of a tariff, as some have already ceased. Such studies as that of Mr. Wright will draw attention to the changing conditions and prepare the public mind for a change of policy that may

be impending within a few years. They will do so if they are as copious in facts and as temperate in statement as this.

Journal of Larocque from the Assiniboine to the Yellowstone, 1805.

Edited with notes by L. J. BURPEE, F.R.G.S. [Publications of the Canadian Archives, no. 3.] (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau. 1910. Pp. 82.)

Journal of the Yukon, 1847-1848. By ALEXANDER HUNTER

MURRAY. Edited with notes by L. J. BURPEE, F.R.G.S. [Publications of the Canadian Archives, no. 4.] (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau. 1910. Pp. 125.)

IN preparing these journals for their present form, Mr. Burpee has written an introduction and copious scholarly notes for each one.

The original of the Larocque journal seems to be lost. A copy of the original came to Laval University through a recent bequest and from this the present publication is made. There are two reasons why the *Journal* is important to American researchers. Larocque's journey to the Rocky Mountains was contemporaneous with that of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. And Larocque was one of the first, if not the first, white man to visit and describe the Crow Indians.

Of the quality, Mr. Burpee says: "Larocque's journal is in fact more readable than many more ambitious narratives of the fur trade. It contains here and there vivid touches that carry the reader back into the heart of that vanished period in western history."

Needed additional words are bracketed and there are other evidences that the journal has been faithfully transcribed.

The *Journal of the Yukon*, though nearly half a century later than the other, covers a country quite as little known at the time as were the Rockies at the time of Larocque's visit. Burpee's introduction corrects a number of apparent blunders by Murray as to historic facts. Probably the greatest value of the journal is the fact that it describes that distant land and its Indians just as the Hudson Bay Company was building there its most remote outpost.

Murray acknowledges that he was building Fort Yukon on Russian land. He gave no explanation of that action nor can any be found except in the "rough-and-tumble methods" that prevailed in the fur-trade of that time. Russia apparently did not realize this was an invasion of her territory. If she did so realize, her quiet acquiescence seems peculiarly strange in the light of the American Cabinet secret of 1845 revealed by Secretary of the Treasury Robert J. Walker. This was that Russia offered all of Russian America to the United States if the cry of "Fifty-four Forty or Fight" was made good and thus Great Britain would be shut off from an approach to the Pacific from the American side.

Murray was well acquainted with the ways of the fur-trade and of Indians. He had spent twenty years in the Mackenzie basin and had

risen to the rank of a chief factor. His observations of the Yukon Indians were made in the light of that extended experience. He recorded a considerable vocabulary and there are a number of clever pen-drawings. He gave to Sir John Richardson information recorded on a map of 1851 which is reproduced in this publication.

The copy of Murray's journal was obtained for the Dominion Archives from E. O. S. Schoefield, legislative librarian, Victoria, British Columbia.

EDMOND S. MEANY.

Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. Las Guerras de México con Tejas y los Estados Unidos. [Documentos Inéditos ó muy Raros para la Historia de México, edited by GENARO GARCÍA. TOMO XXIX.] (Mexico: Bouret. 1910. Pp. 344.)

We again have to thank Señor D. Genaro García for a volume bearing upon Mexican history that is of direct interest to American investigators. The documents here presented are not indeed new, but it is extremely hard to obtain them and therefore this reproduction is very welcome. The first (62 pp.) is Santa Anna's Manifesto of May 10, 1837, giving an account of his operations in Texas the previous year. One notes in particular here (pp. 27-29) his defense of the butchery at Goliad on the grounds that it was required by the law, that there was no place in which to secure the prisoners, that it was not practicable to send them to Matamoros, that the Mexicans had not enough food for them, and that they might have overpowered their captors. For several of these excuses precedents could be found in the customs of the American Indians, but, as for the first one, the Mexican Minister of Foreign Relations assured the British representative that the atrocities perpetrated in Texas were contrary to orders sent to Santa Anna "early in the Campaign" (Pakenham, no. 74, October 24, 1836). Next we remark his excuses (p. 46) for taking a nap in the face of the enemy at San Jacinto: (1) his great exertions; (2) his loss of sleep the previous night; and (3) his weak and sickly constitution ("un físico débil y enfermizo"). It throws light upon the question—if there be a question—of his credibility to reflect that he lived to an advanced age in spite of great labors, anxieties, and dissipations, and the editor aids us by citing the testimony of his friend and aide-de-camp, Giménez (p. 46), that the general was very robust. More significant still is his pretense (p. 57) that his agreements with the Texans, made after his capture, were entirely personal ("no con el carácter oficial de presidente de la República . . . ni menos como General en Jefe"), when in fact his public covenant began with the words, "Artículos de un convenio celebrado entre S. E. el General en Jefe . . . D. Antonio López de Santa Anna", and his secret covenant with these, "Antonio López de Santa Anna, General en Jefe del Ejército de Operaciones y Presidente de la República Mexicana". Next come 113 pages of documents sub-

mitted with the Manifesto, many of which are of permanent value. Then follows (pp. 185-197) Santa Anna's defense of his proceedings in the war against the United States, dated March 24, 1848. This must of course be read and analyzed by the historian of that war, but it is too superficial and partizan to be of much assistance. Finally, pages 201-335 give us D. Ramón Gamboa's *Impugnacion*, dated July 15, 1849, which presents and answers Santa Anna's replies to Gamboa's formal charge of August 27, 1847, that he had betrayed the country in the wars with Texas and the United States. This document is of no little importance to American historians. Gamboa's theory was wrong, his attitude prejudiced, and his information defective; but he offers precious material which with due caution can be employed by one in possession of the inside facts. His main contention was that Santa Anna, by an understanding with the United States, conducted his operations in such a way as to play into the hands of the American generals, whereas the truth appears to be that, in accordance with the arrangement concluded with Commander Mackenzie, he returned to Mexico intending to make peace on terms acceptable to Polk, but on finding that he could not bring his nation to that point, saw that his only chance to save himself was to take the lead in the fighting, and—being no strategist either by nature or by training—was outmanoeuvred as well as out-fought. In Gamboa's summing up (pp. 332-334) one is surprised to see no mention of the abandonment of Tampico, a prominent popular subject of complaint against the general. The volume concludes with a brief but useful index. The printer who set up Jackson's letter (pp. 176-178) had not fully mastered the intricacies of English orthography.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

MINOR NOTICES

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1908. Volume I. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1909 [1910], pp. 539.) This volume opens with the usual reports of the preceding meeting (Washington-Richmond, December, 1908) of the Association and of the Pacific Coast Branch, followed by reports of five conferences which occurred on the former occasion. These reports, ampler than those given in this journal (XIV. 429-452), are accompanied by the text of several of the brief papers read in the conferences, such as Professor Bassett's on the influence of coast line and rivers on North Carolina, Miss Davenport's on the manuscript materials for English diplomatic history, Professor Larson's on Old Norse sources in English history, Miss Flisch's on the common people of the old South, and Mr. Leland's on the application of photography to archive and historical work. Two papers read before the Pacific Coast Branch are next printed, that of Mr. Don E. Smith on the Viceroy of New Spain in the Eighteenth Century, and that of Mr. Frederick J. Teggart entitled

"Notes Supplementary to any Edition of Lewis and Clark", and relating to the Company of Explorers of the Missouri and the efforts of Evans, Mackay, and Truteau. Then follow the suggestive papers read at Washington by Mr. Joseph A. Hill on the Historical Value of the Census Records and by Mr. William Nelson on the American Newspapers of the Eighteenth Century as Sources of History, and those read in Richmond, on the Wilderness Campaign, by the late General E. P. Alexander, Colonel William R. Livermore, and Major Eben Swift. The volume concludes with the ninth annual report of the Public Archives Commission, 260 pages of thoroughly well prepared matter, comprising full reports on the archives of Maine, by Professor Allen Johnson, of Missouri, by Professor Jonas Viles, and of the state of Washington, by Professor J. N. Bowman, and a valuable list of the journals and acts of the councils and assemblies of the thirteen colonies and the Floridas, preserved in the Public Record Office. The index is much better than that of most preceding volumes of the Reports.

Questioned Documents: a Study of Questioned Documents, with an outline of methods by which the facts may be discovered and shown. By Albert S. Osborn, Examiner of Questioned Documents. With an Introduction by Professor John H. Wigmore. (Rochester, N. Y., The Lawyer's Co-operative Publishing Company, 1910, pp. xxiv, 501.) This book, by one of the most widely known American experts in the detection of fraudulent documents (his part in the Conger-Allds investigation is still in fresh remembrance), is of course meant primarily for the use of lawyers, not of historians. But the processes of fraud have been much the same in all ages, and modern methods of detection may be employed to good purpose upon the documents of the past; nor are they less valuable in determining or in demonstrating the authorship of anonymous manuscripts of every sort. Mr. Osborn discusses the uses of photography and of the microscope as well as of the trained eye and suggests many an ingenious appliance besides. Not only handwriting, but ink too and paper, yes and even questioned typewriting, come in for careful treatment. Especially useful are the many photographic facsimiles of suspected documents and of the processes used in establishing their falsehood or their genuineness. Many a historical investigator will be glad to know that such a guide is in existence.

The Evolution of Property from Savagery to Civilization. By Paul Lafargue. (Chicago, Charles H. Kerr and Company, 1910, pp. 160.) This compact little book, in the guise of a study of the evolution of property, is an earnest and forceful indictment of the bourgeois capitalistic régime by an apostle of communism. The text comprises five short chapters entitled respectively: Forms of Contemporaneous Property; Primitive Communism; Family or Consanguine Collectivism; Feudal

Property; and Bourgeois Property. As often in similar doctrinaire discussions, throughout this essay there is a tendency to take as basic facts generalizations which mature scholarship does not always support. Thus, a primitive matriarchate or period in which woman had political as well as domestic supremacy is assumed, although the theory of Bachofen is now far from being generally accepted as axiomatic truth. On the other hand, many facts which we have entirely forgotten or which we are inclined to ignore are set in a clear light. The undoubted evils due to capitalistic supremacy are shrewdly disclosed. Here is a book which should prove beneficial to the ardent disciple of Blackstone. To say the least, it ought to help break down the blind reverence for the juridical legalism, which, in its excessive zeal for the protection of the prescriptive property rights of the individual, is seriously hindering the proper socialization of our laws and our courts.

The author concludes that "the final communist and international revolution of property is inevitable." For "already, in the midst of bourgeois civilization, do the institutions and communistic customs of primitive times revive."

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques. Publié sous la direction de Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, Recteur de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, M. Albert Vogt, Docteur ès Lettres, et M. Urbain Rouziès. Fascicule I., Aachs-Achot. (Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1909, pp. 319.) This *Dictionnaire* is uniform in size and arrangement with the *Dictionnaires de la Bible, de Théologie Catholique, d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* already in course of publication by the same firm. Besides the subject of ecclesiastical geography the editors include in the scope of their work ecclesiastical institutions and the lives and activities of the foremost ecclesiastical worthies. If it is possible to form a judgment from the first fascicule the undertaking will derive its permanent value from the geographical rather than the biographical studies. Much has been recently published in encyclopedias about the great figures of Christian history, but extended monographs on ecclesiastical areas and places are not so easily attainable. A good example of the latter is the article on Abyssinia by I. Guidi, which contains an excellent summary of the history, the theology, and the ritual of the Abyssinian Church. The *Dictionnaire* is entirely the work of Catholic scholars and will deal only with topics directly connected with the Catholic Church.

The Source of "Jerusalem the Golden", together with other Pieces attributed to Bernard of Cluny. In English translation, by Henry Preble. Introduction, Notes, and Annotated Bibliography by Samuel Macauley Jackson, Philip Schaff Memorial Professor of Church History in New York University. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1910, pp. vii, 207.) The core of this book is the *De Contemptu Mundi* of

Bernard of Cluny, translated into English by Henry Preble, which occupies three-fourths of the one hundred pages given to translations. The introductory matter, which occupies another one hundred pages, includes an historical introduction and a bibliography, the latter being perhaps nine times as long and important as the former. There is a suitable index.

This translation of Bernard's "On Scorn of the World" is most welcome. To add one more of the really characteristic books of the Middle Ages to the number of those accessible in English translation and in convenient form is in itself a real contribution to historical study and teaching, and this one is well chosen and executed. Like Coulson's paraphrase of Salimbene, this translation will do more to give a lively idea of the time to the average reader and teacher of medieval history than half a dozen editions of the text.

The historical introduction is rather slight and perhaps even more non-committal than is necessary. It would have done no harm at least to have recited the arguments for the English origin of Bernard.

The bibliography is obviously the part on which the editor has lavished time, labor, and affection quite in proportion to the space that he has allowed, and in it he has made real contribution—of a sort more often found with editions than with translations, to be sure, but none the less welcome for that. He has seen, as he says, every manuscript and every translation of the poem of which he has heard and every edition that exists, and he describes them all minutely, with a gusto for details which sometimes leads to a certain discursiveness of style, as well as excess of detail, both of which things will be readily forgiven. The half-page digression on the *Dictionary of National Biography*, the long full titles inclusive even of poetical quotations, the frequent careful datings of minor bibliographical adventures, giving year, month, day of month, and day of week, are a little out of perspective, but, at worst, err on the side of generosity and do no harm.

The work as a whole is the useful and scholarly aggregate of an able encyclopedia editor and impassioned bibliographer, riding, in a way of his own, the difficult fence between the popular and the highly scholastic, and providing material for both teacher and research student.

E. C. RICHARDSON.

Les Cas Royaux: Origine et Développement de la Théorie aux XIII^e et XIV^e Siècles. Par Ernest Perrot, Chargé de Conférences à la Faculté de Droit de Paris. (Paris, Arthur Rousseau, 1910, pp. 370.) In spite of great advance made in the institutional history of medieval France, there are still large gaps in our information, and a thorough study of the *Cas Royaux* has long been necessary. The theories of the early legists and of scholars like Du Cange, Laurière, Jousse, and even Brussel, must be taken with caution. Numbers of institutions which it would be important to know both from the point of view of

history and of law, until the appearance of the present work, have not been the subject of minute investigation.

In the matter of the sources for this subject there is wide variation. Those of the thirteenth century have almost all been printed. On the other hand few of those pertaining to the fourteenth have seen the light. Laborde and Boutaric published two volumes of the *Actes du Parlement de Paris* (1863-1867), and Beugnot, three volumes (in four) of the *Olim* (1839-1849). But the printed series of the criminal registers does not go beyond 1312, and the civil registers only to 1318. The quantity of manuscript material, we are told, is so great that no one scholar can hope to digest all of it. Since practically all the *cas royaux* were in the domain of criminal law M. Perrot has chosen three series of special value—the thirteen registers of the Parlement of Paris extending to 1400; the registers of the Grands Jours de Troyes which begin in 1367; the registers of the Exchequer of Normandy, which extend, with lacunae, from 1336. None of these records is complete, especially the first, but the gaps are partly filled by a digest of them made by Lenain in the seventeenth century.

The body of the book is in three parts. In the first eleven various kinds of *cas royaux* are distinguished, among them being the crimes of lèse majesté, counterfeiting, official maladministration, infraction of royal safeguards, highway robbery, etc. The second part is a highly technical inquiry into the nature and procedure of the *cas royaux*. The third is a particular study of the ducal causes in Normandy. It is impossible in a brief review to set forth the amount of new information the author has amassed. It is novel, for example, to find heresy at the end of the fourteenth century considered as a *cas royal* (p. 34). To most readers part I. will prove of greatest interest and value, but the student of law will find much in the highly technical pages of part II. in which, it may be said, M. Perrot shows that the term *cas royaux* was of sixteenth century devising and foreign to the legal terminology of the Middle Ages. There are thirty-four pages of *pièces justificatives*.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Inventaire des Sceaux de la Collection des Pièces Originales du Cabinet des Titres à la Bibliothèque Nationale. Par J. Roman, Correspondant de l'Institut. Tome I. [Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publiés par les soins du Ministre de l'Instruction Publique. Troisième Série: Archéologie.] (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1909, pp. v, 943.) To the great French catalogues of seals—Douet d'Arcq's of those in the national archives, Demay's of those of Flanders, of Artois and Picardy, of Normandy, of the collection Clairambault—this work worthily adds another. The seals here catalogued now belong, like those of the Clairambault collection, to the French national library; and to the catalogue of that collection, published a quarter-century ago in the same great series of "documents inédits", the present may be regarded as a

sequel. Of the seals now catalogued the larger part were once the property of the dramatist Caron de Beaumarchais, so notably connected with both the American and the French Revolution. Saved, with the parchments that bore them, from the fire which in 1737 devastated the *Chambre des Comptes* of Paris, they were sold him as waste. In 1784-1785 he sold them back to the royal library, some six hundred quintals of them, for sixty thousand livres. With them are catalogued the gatherings of other collectors and those of the heralds of the realm. Of the fifteen thousand seals belonging to the "*pièces originales*" only about eleven thousand, however, will be included in the catalogue: those posterior to 1600 are admitted only when remarkable for the eminence of their owners or the interest of their types. Pictorial reproductions there are none; nor are any promised for the second volume, which will complete the work. The legends, however, are carefully transcribed, so far as they can still be read.

G. L. B.

Recueil de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie Drapière en Flandre. Publié par Georges Espinas et Henri Pirenne. Tome deuxième. [Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire.] (Bruxelles, P. Imbreghts, 1909, pp. x, 714.) The products of medieval Flemish industry were, in the main, for home consumption, but even at an early date cloth was manufactured expressly for export. Regulations in its regard became of international importance, and such as are preserved have many tales to tell if read between the lines. This valuable collection has been under way for thirteen years. Volume I. (1906) contained documents of fourteen cities taken alphabetically. Volume II. also covers fourteen, Deynze to Hulst, but actually the papers pertaining to Douai and Ghent absorb the major part of the 712 pages, though only the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are considered and though the Ghent file proved meagre in comparison with Arras, Bruges, etc., in spite of the undoubted importance of the Ghent drapery. Probably charters and registers disappeared in the political broils frequent in Ghent. The work of MM. Espinas and Pirenne is of inestimable worth for economic history.

Geschichte der Herzöge von Burgund, 1363-1477. Von Otto Cartellieri. Erster Band. *Philipp der Kühne.* (Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer, 1910, pp. xii, 189.) This little volume furnishes a splendid guide to pertinent matter in fourteen archives and to an exhaustive bibliography for the beginnings of the Valois dynasty in Burgundy. The narrative purporting to be a biography of Philip the Bold is little more than an attachment to this important bibliographical matter. It is a mere barren scaffold whereon to hang learned and suggestive references. In itself it is arid and almost unreadable, the sole illumination on its chronological pages being quotations from Froissart and Deschamps.

Every petty statement is painfully well attested, so that greedy footnotes eat up nearly a third of every page. Possibly the author will be more expansive in the volumes still to come. It is to be hoped so, for there is ample room for a reliable history of the dukes of Burgundy to replace the many imperfections and shortcomings of Barante. Professor Cartellieri of Heidelberg assuredly should have been the one to write it, for he has steeped himself in his subject, but unfortunately in this volume he has allowed himself to be overpowered by the flood of matter instead of controlling it with a strong hand. He has tried to touch on collateral details naturally suggested because Burgundy of the late fourteenth century was more or less involved with the Empire, the papacy, Flanders, and England as well as France, and in this small compass the details obscure and do not illuminate; and there is no generalization, no universal comment to give them a spark of light. Out of the 189 pages 114 are devoted to the narrative, 12 to appendixes, 36 to *pièces justificatives*, 25 to bibliography, tables, and index. It is an overweighted volume of meagre interest but may easily be of great service to the next comer into the Valois-Burgundian field.

The Life of Reginald Pole. By Martin Haile. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910, pp. xv, 554.) This book adds one more to the already long list of recent attempts to disseminate and popularize the Roman Catholic view of the great figures of the Reformation. It is written in an interesting and attractive style and numerous excerpts from the original sources appear to corroborate (for the casual reader at least) the prefatory statement that it is "based not only upon already recorded facts, but upon the vast treasure revealed by the diligent students of the archives of Europe". The fact that it was projected and begun by the late Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton, whose monographs have attracted favorable comment in various historical journals, affords additional ground for rosy anticipations. It is prettily printed and bound, and contains numerous excellent illustrations.

Careful reading, however, will effectually shatter the favorable impressions derived from a casual glance. The truth is, that Mr. Haile's book, like most of the species to which it belongs, does not deserve to be treated as serious history. It contains little or nothing which is not as well or better told in one or another of the earlier lives of Pole. The author either ignores or else wilfully disregards the vast majority of non-Catholic scientific historians who have dealt with this field during the past twenty-five years; and though he has used the sources, he diverges from the usual interpretation of them to a degree which demands fuller explanation and corroboration than he is willing to give. A casual comparison of his quotations with the originals from which they are taken affords abundant proof that he does not appreciate the sanctity of inverted commas. There are many misprints and minor errors, *e. g.*, the statement on page 62 that "Ferdinand VII." had obtained from Rome "a breve of Julius II." amplifying and confirming

the dispensation sent to England for the marriage of Henry VIII. and Katharine of Aragon. "Pole's book" is cited under four different titles, one of which, at least, contains a grave transgression of the rules of Latin grammar. The judgments of men and events throughout are most extraordinary. The author's estimate of Pole is fair enough, for the cardinal was one of those happy beings whom friends and foes have always united to praise; but in his characterizations of Pole's contemporaries both in England and on the Continent Mr. Haile shows strong bias and lamentable inadequacy of historical equipment. Instruction and amusement may be derived from a comparison of his estimates of Charles V. and Francis I. with those of the late Bishop Stubbs in the first section of the *Lectures on European History*.

R. B. M.

Le Siège de Malte par les Turcs en 1565. Publié en Français et en Grec d'après les Éditions de 1567 et de 1571. Par Hubert Pernot, Docteur ès Lettres, Répétiteur à l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes. (Paris, Honoré Champion, 1910, pp. xvi, 199.) This work forms a volume in the *Collection de Monuments pour servir à l'Étude de la Langue et de la Littérature Néo-Helléniques*.

Of the two relations edited by M. Pernot, one, in French prose, is ascribed to Pierre Gentil de Vendosme, the other, in Greek, to Antoine Achelis. The latter, an example of Cretan literature of little value historically, is a poetic version of the former. The publication of both within the same covers serves to illustrate (Pernot, p. ix) "par un exemple caractéristique un procédé littéraire qu'Achéliis n'est pas seul à avoir employé, mais qu'il nous est rarement donné d'apercevoir de façon aussi nette".

The prose version, written by a contemporary, containing letters from Malta and Sicily, temperate and impartial in character, is a valuable source. M. Pernot chooses the French or fourth edition, passing over the three earlier Italian editions; and does not explain why he assigns its authorship to Gentil de Vendosme, whose name is signed to the first (1565), third (1566), and fourth (1567) editions, rather than to Marino Fracasso, who is connected with the first edition, is the only author mentioned in the second (1565), and to whom Achelis refers (V. 1420-1429). This situation reminds the student of the sixteenth century of that relation of Charles V.'s campaign against Tunis, which has been credited to Antoine de Perrenin and to Guillaume de Montoiche.

ARTHUR IRVING ANDREWS.

The Parallel between the English and American Civil Wars. The Rede Lecture, delivered in the Senate House, Cambridgé, on 14 June, 1910. By Charles Harding Firth, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford. (Cambridge, University Press, 1910, pp. 50.) Professor Firth points out a similarity in the political causes of the two great conflicts, in the struggle respecting sovereignty, but shows how

different was the political problem respecting union. In the military aspect, he shows the resemblances growing out of the efforts to form armies from raw material, the superficial resemblance of objective—London-Oxford and Washington-Richmond, the great difference between a sectional war and one in which parties were much less localized. The consideration of the differing rôles played by aristocracy leads to a comparison between Cromwell and Lincoln, in statesmanship and in religion. The lecture closes its suggestive pages with a comparison of results, and of the part played by compromise and moderation in them.

Versailles Royal. Par J. Fennebresque. (Paris, Honoré Champion, 1910, pp. 282.) M. Fennebresque has considered Versailles from a point of view "tout utilitaire". By the side of the "futilities that made up the life of the court" there was "a current of serious ideas followed, for the most part, by practical and durable results". Among these serious ideas were the formation of the Grand Canal, with its flotilla of craft of all kind; the organization of a "Little Venice"; the establishment of experimental gardens of various sorts; the "Orangerie"; the replantation of the gardens and parks of Versailles; and the project of a museum. The problem of supplying the canal and fountains of Versailles with water led to experiments that contributed to the progress of hydraulics and mechanics; the canal served as a "porte d'essai" for engines of war and vessels of various types, and between Havre and Versailles "there was a constant exchange of specialists and circulation of material"; so valuable were the results obtained by the application of new methods of culture to fruit trees and vegetables that Versailles later became the seat of the National School of Horticulture; the botanical garden was highly esteemed by scientists; valuable experiments were conducted at Versailles in agriculture, in infantry tactics, in gunnery, and in ballooning. In addition to this little-known side of Versailles, the volume contains a few chapters on the "futilities" of the royal residence, such as the Hermitage of Mme. de Pompadour, Itinerary of the Promenades of the Royal Family in the Parks of Versailles, two chapters on Mme. Elizabeth, and one—not to be numbered among the "futilities"—on the Petit Séminaire de Versailles. M. Fennebresque has done his work well, drawing his data from the archives of France and Venice, from the most valuable printed sources, and from a large collection of monographs on Versailles. The work is illustrated by several full-page half-tones.

F. M. F.

Letters and Papers of Charles, Lord Barham, Admiral of the Red Squadron. Volume II. Edited by Sir John Knox Laughton, M.A., D.Litt., Hon. Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, Fellow of King's College, London. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XXXVIII.] (Printed for the Society, 1909, pp. xxii, 438.) The chronological period covered by this second volume of the letters of Lord

Barham is that of 1779-1795. His letters to Lord Sandwich in the period of the American Revolution contain very serious criticisms of the Admiralty Board, and the replies of the First Lord of the Admiralty show a marked unwillingness to profit by the representations of his sedulous friend. Lord Sandwich's abuse of his office, especially his shameful perversion of its patronage, is notorious. If half the criticisms of Lord Barham (then plain Charles Middleton) were justified, the weakness and erratic conduct of the British navy during a good part of the Revolutionary War is perfectly explicable. The "impress service" was made frightfully expensive because large numbers of the impressed men had soon to be discharged as invalids or unserviceable, ships lay idle in the ports for want of orders an incredibly long time, the "desertions from ships and hospitals are beyond imagination", the discipline of the service was "entirely lost", all, writes Middleton, "owing to admiralty indulgence, but still more to admiralty negligence". The representations of Middleton, made with perfect frankness to Lord Sandwich, constitute a serious indictment of the Admiralty Board. As Middleton wrote: "The whole system of the admiralty is rotten and it must tumble about your lordship's ears if it is not soon altered."

After appealing in vain to Lord Sandwich, Middleton turned to Lord North and Lord George Germain, and finally to the king. A commission of inquiry was at last appointed, and a large number of the papers included in this volume are sketches of reports referring to the work of the Navy Board, and intended for the use of that commission. In fact that commission, the editor informs us, was mainly guided by the carefully prepared papers of Middleton. These sketches, together with many crude memoranda, notes for letters to be written, and the rough copies of letters sent, constitute the greater part of this second volume of the Lord Barham papers. This volume differs from the first in that nearly all the material here presented is the composition of Middleton himself. His account of the work of the Navy Board—and Middleton knew the whole system—is a very valuable contribution to the inner history of the British navy.

In May, 1794, Middleton joined the Admiralty as senior naval lord under Lord Chatham. His letters from that time on throw much light on the conduct of the early years of the long war with France. When Chatham retired, Earl Spencer succeeded him, and official differences with the new head finally compelled Middleton's resignation. The details of the quarrel are found in the correspondence presented in this publication.

The editing exhibits the same high standard of scholarship manifested in the first volume of these papers. There is an excellent introduction and a very useful index.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The French Revolution: a Political History, 1789-1804. In four volumes. By A. Aulard, Professor of Letters at the University of Paris. Translated from the French of the third edition, with a preface,

notes, and historical summary by Bernard Miall. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910, pp. 367; 322; 392; 334.) The first French edition of this work appeared in 1901 and was described in this journal, VII. 567. The third edition, published in 1905, from which Mr. Miall's translation is made, differs from the first only in the correction of errata. The translator has added more than one hundred pages of supplementary matter, chiefly chronological summaries and biographical notes. In a preface to the first volumes he gives a review of conditions in France on the eve of the Revolution. He has enlarged the index somewhat by adding to the principal page-references a few words indicating in each case the point, but he has not ventured to add subject-references to the references to names tabulated in the original index, although this would have increased the usefulness of the volumes.

The translator has, on the whole, succeeded in rendering the French clearly and in vigorous English. Occasionally the choice of a word or phrase does not seem fortunate. For example, Professor Aulard's words "un testament de mort" in reference to Robespierre's speech, July 26, 1794, is translated a "death testament". The word "épuration", applied to the sifting process by which committees could be relieved of the presence of "undesirable citizens", is translated "purgation", perhaps because Carlyle used the same word, but it does not look natural out of Carlyle's pages. There is no suggestion in the French word of such an equivalent, and if it is desired to recall Colonel Pride's method, why not use the shorter word "purge"?

The value of the chronological summaries prefixed to the volumes is doubtful. It would have been better to have allowed Professor Aulard to have told his own story without addition or comment. The translator's statements do not always agree with the text. Professor Aulard says of the speech of July 26, "it does in truth produce an effect of melancholy not wholly devoid of nobility", and refers to it as a "grand discours", but in his summary Mr. Miall explains that Robespierre "in a long, wild speech out-Héberts Hébert". It is difficult to understand how he could have read the speech and yet so described it. Perhaps he was thinking of Carlyle's characterization of the speech, which was hardly more exact. The summaries are also not free from errors of fact; for example, the statement that Babeuf committed suicide in court, or that the German troops, July 12, 1789, fired on the people in the Tuileries gardens. But in spite of such defects in the editing of the work, students and teachers of the French Revolution must feel under obligation to the translator and publishers for bringing before the larger audience that cannot readily use the original so excellent and well-printed a version of Professor Aulard's great book.

H. E. B.

Le Club des Cordeliers pendant la Crise de Varennes et le Massacre du Champ de Mars. Documents en grande partie Inédits, publiés avec des Éclaircissements, des Notes, et une Planche par Albert Mathiez.

(Paris, H. Champion, 1910, pp. iv, 392.) By the side of the monumental and semi-official publications edited by Aulard and the late Sigismond Lacroix, this volume seems very modest indeed. It is, however, so far as its scope allows, a valuable contribution to the history of the French Revolution at one of its critical moments. It affords a survey of the activities of the Cordeliers after the flight of the king, and gives considerable that is new and of interest on the beginnings of republicanism in France.

The first forty pages, M. Mathiez devotes to a sketch of the early history of the Cordeliers, "ce club plus célèbre que connu". He points out clearly and in telling epigrammatic language the difference in the organization, purposes, and activities of the Cordeliers and the Jacobins. On the question of origin he differs radically from Aulard and the accepted view, and successfully argues for a date in April, 1790 (pp. 2, 161). The remainder of the work is given to sources and notes. These fall naturally into two groups. The first deals with the sessions of the club; and in the absence of the procès-verbal, which existed only in manuscript and was probably destroyed, the proceedings are pieced together from the club's journal, from decrees, placards, and other writings emanating from the society. The second group relates to "Le procès du Champs de Mars", a considerable portion having appeared separately in the first number for 1910 of the *Annales Révolutionnaires*. Here the documents are drawn from "le dossier judiciaire", the reports of the special committees of the assembly, the papers of the accused lawyer M. Buirette de Verrières, and from the trial of Bailly before the Revolutionary Tribunal.

The editing is scrupulously in accord with approved standards; the notes are numerous and scholarly, though one might justly ask for a more charitable attitude towards co-workers whom the documents prove in error (cf. pp. 2, 3, 45, n. 1, 49, n. 2, 161, etc.). Historical scholarship is greatly indebted to M. Mathiez for making accessible this material for the history of a society about whose influence there has long been so much conjecture.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

L'Église de Paris et la Révolution. Par P. Pisani, Chanoine de Notre-Dame de Paris, Docteur ès-Lettres. Volume III., 1796-1799. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1910, pp. 430.) This third volume tells a story that is less tragic than the preceding one. No guillotine, no violences at the hands of the mob, and, except for the short period of Fructidor, no serious persecutions. The religious policy of the Directory is not without analogies with that of the Third Republic: a policy of suspicious and armed neutrality, with occasional outbursts of intolerance. Since the separation of Church and State was the law, the government was only concerned with defending itself against a possible reaction; hence the deportation of several hundreds of nonjurors or "renegades" who had not taken the new oath of "hatred for royalty and anarchy" called for by the law of the 19 Fructidor, an V.; hence also

the closing of churches that had been opened unlawfully, the law allowing only fifteen in Paris. But M. Pisani acknowledges the improvement of conditions and establishes an instructive parallel between the attitude of the Terrorist administration and that of the Directory. "Under the Directory the law reigns; a law always interpreted in its narrowest sense and somewhat stretched to fit the occasion: but even arbitrary measures are covered and sanctioned by legislative power." He is obliged to recognize also that the hostility towards the Church is not due only to fanaticism and hatred for what *L'Ami du Peuple* calls "an erroneous religion"; it was due, to a large extent, as it has been under the Third Republic, to the fact that the Church was "compromised" by the "support" of the foes of the constitution.

The story of these three years, 1796-1798, is thus mainly taken up by the controversies, discussions, and quarrels of *Les Réunis* and *Le Presbytère*, which were the principal organs of the constitutionals; the encyclical of December, 1795, in which the prelates set forth their Gallicanism; the abortive brief of Pius VI. of July, 1796, calling for the recognition of the government by the Catholics; the election of the constitutional bishop of Paris; and the proceedings of the National Council of 1797. The chapters, however, that are more likely to interest the general reader are those devoted to the famous sect of the "Theophilanthropes" and to the efforts made by the Directory to enforce the new division of the month into *décades* and the futile and somewhat ridiculous attempts to dethrone Sunday for the benefit of the *décadi*.

The compliments which we have in our previous notes given to the impartiality of M. Pisani as a historian may justify us in regretting that he should feel obliged, when discussing men and doctrines that are not, like himself, under the cover of official orthodoxy, to use language that is more of the journalist than the scholar or the priest, the flippant vulgarity of which cannot but detract from his authority and trustworthiness.

O. G.

A Century of Empire, 1801-1900. In three volumes. By the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D. Volume II., 1833-1863. (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910, pp. xiii, 355.) The second of Sir Herbert Maxwell's three volumes, *A Century of Empire*, is a consistent continuation of the first. There is the same easy narrative style in the relation of successive political events and intimate political gossip of the period covered, 1833 to 1868; also a half-dozen very good engravings. In addition is the author's avowal of Tory principles, justified by his belief that without partizanship history is not "readable" and that "it is peculiarly unfortunate for the Tory and Conservative party that English historians of the nineteenth century have been hitherto, without a single exception, Whigs or Radicals" (p. 18). Here then one may look for the present-day Tory interpretation of the events of this interesting period. Except for its sharp denunciation of Walpole's findings the point of view is

not ultra and the treatment is generally kindly. Certain Tory leaders are subjected to criticism, notably Disraeli, to whose gifts of speech and tact the author accords only moderate approbation. Of the Liberal or Whig leaders, Melbourne receives the most generous and sympathetic treatment, "masking unsparing industry and excellent business capacity under an affectation of indolence and *poco curante*" (p. 72). The opportunity of piling up evidence of Palmerston's essential inefficiency has been eagerly grasped, though Lord John Russell is more harshly treated than any other Whig minister, mainly on the ground of egotistical self-seeking and political treachery.

Throughout the volume there appear occasional references to present-day topics in relation to past events. Thus, in treating of the Crimean War and the Turkish question, the author dissents from Lord Salisbury's later declaration that English policy in defending Turkey had been mistaken, maintaining that recent Turkish reform movements attest the beneficial results of England's friendship. Not that Sir Herbert Maxwell applauds Turkish liberalism, but that in its basic principles he sees an element binding the states together—thus checking foreign aggression. For this happy result the old Tory policy is held responsible.

English relations with the United States are barely touched—the topics connected with the Civil War occupying but ten pages. Not merely aristocratic and governing England, but practically all England, the author states, sympathized with the South. No proof, however, is presented (p. 306). Regarding English neutrality, "The plain and unpalatable truth is that the *Alabama* was, to all intent and purpose, an English pirate." The superficial character of the work is apparent in the treatment of the cotton famine, for, quite evidently, neither Rhodes nor Arnold has been consulted, while the one reference given, presumably to Watts, is cited as "Walls". But the volume is not serious history, though in its thoroughly readable narrative of personages and manoeuvres it offers diverting Tory criticism of English politics.

E. D. ADAMS.

Die Ueberleitung Preussens in das Konstitutionelle System durch den zweiten Vereinigten Landtag. Herausgegeben von Hans Mähl. (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1909, pp. xii, 268.) The multitudinous and far-reaching revolutionary movements of the year 1848 have somewhat overshadowed the earlier phases of Prussian constitutional development which happened to fall within the same period. The present monograph is a minute and critical study of the second United Diet. The brevity of the Diet is no fair measure of its importance, for, in contrast with the first United Diet of 1847, it actually accomplished results that gave direction to the later constitutional history of Prussia. In his introduction the author gives a sketch of the constitutional movement up to March, 1848. It is shown that the policy of Frederick William IV., always idealistic and vacillating, was the outgrowth of

the king's theory of absolutism rather than of his German national ideas, as Ranke and others have maintained.

The book has three divisions, dealing with the preparatory discussion during the time of the Arnim ministry, the work of the Diet itself, and the struggle with the social revolution. Especial attention is given to the analysis of public opinion in the days immediately following March 18. Mähl declares that this date may be taken as the "birthday of political parties in Prussia". It was now, and not at the time of the first Diet, as Treitschke held, that the scattered and unassimilated parts of the monarchy became nationalized. This was particularly true of the Rhine provinces. It is an interesting example of the unifying power of public opinion long repressed but now finding an adequate means of expression. The exuberant and self-confident political activity of the time gave evidence of a long period of reparation. It is made clear that the popular will was for the time dominant, and that during the March days the people calmly assumed that the constitution was actually to be what they willed it to be.

The Diet had to deal with three questions, the draft of a constitution, the electoral law, and the financial problem. That the movement was not premature is shown by the rapidity and effectiveness with which these matters were disposed of. Mähl believes that Prussia now profited by the Stein-Hardenberg reforms of 1811, because those reforms saved the government and ruling classes from the bitterness of the peasants that must otherwise have had to be reckoned with in this revolutionary year. There was as yet little trace of class antagonism or of any class-conscious movement on the part of the laborers. But while it is unsafe to conclude that the Prussian revolution was, from the side of the proletariat, a social revolution, it is made clear that political questions were already beginning to be recognized as fundamentally social in their bearing.

The book is in no sense a specific history of the Prussia revolution even during the actual life of the Diet. It is rather an exhaustive, almost a microscopic, analysis of the workings of public opinion as expressed through newspapers, letters, addresses, and the speeches in the Diet itself. There is a copious bibliography but no index.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

The Making of the Balkan States. By William Smith Murray, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XXXIX., no. 1.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910, pp. 199.) Walpole in his *History of Twenty-five Years* says that Palmerston declared that only three men in Europe ever understood the Schleswig-Holstein Question, and added that one, the Prince Consort, was dead, another, a Danish statesman, was mad, and the third (he himself) had forgotten it.

Not less intricate and tangled are questions encountered in tracing the history of the Balkan States. Dr. Murray has, with bravery and

patience, in preparing what we take to be a doctor's thesis, addressed himself to the task of exploring the voluminous literature, which in various tongues is accessible on the subject. He has done his work with thoroughness. Indeed he has gone so much into detail that in a work of two hundred pages it is impossible not to run the risk of being rather arid. But he has made a creditable and scholarly study. He appreciates correctly the characteristics of the different states and traces with clearness the relations of the great powers to the conflicts between those states and the Ottoman Empire. Since his work was written Montenegro has risen to the dignity of a kingdom. Perhaps this adds new force to his sound conclusion that a confederation of the Balkan States is not probable.

Number 19 of the *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* (New York, the Society, 1910, pp. ix, 259) has as its longest article one by Mr. Samuel Oppenheim on the Jews and Masonry in the United States before 1810. Mr. Leon Hühner collects the scanty data respecting Jews connected with the colleges of the thirteen original states prior to 1800. Mr. David Sulzberger relates the history of the beginnings of the immigration of Russian Jews into Philadelphia; and there are in the volume various minor notes.

Legal Development in Colonial Massachusetts, 1630-1686. By Charles J. Hilkey, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XXXVII., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910, pp. 148.) In his essay on *Legal Development in Colonial Massachusetts* Mr. Charles J. Hilkey has been very industrious in noting his cases and arranging them according to subject-matter, and his citation of authorities is accurate. The history of the lawmaking factors is naturally imperfect, as that history would require in itself a large treatise. The participation of the church elders in the framing and interpretation of laws is almost wholly neglected, though the church exercised an important influence, and in matters of doubt, was as gravely consulted as any constitutional lawyer could be. While the church was nominally under the state, the church for more than a generation was the more important factor in law. Many of the forms of legal process were borrowed direct from England, others came into use because of their adaptation to colonial conditions. Mr. Hilkey says the colonists tended to revert to early law, and it was not English law of necessity, for the Mosaic law applied in criminal cases. He overlooks the early use of a jury at Plymouth, and in confining himself to the court records fails to avail himself of much interesting explanation of the adoption of a law. The mere crime or sin counts but for little; political or religious agencies pointed out a remedy or a punishment. In this direction the essay could well be developed.

Some Records of Sussex County, Delaware. Compiled by C. H. B. Turner. (Philadelphia, Allen, Lane, and Scott, 1909, pp. 387.) It is no

small credit to the little state of Delaware that it maintained its integrity as a colony and state, for few states of the Union have been more exposed to colonial envy and the danger of annexation than the Diamond State. Among the most interesting chapters in the history of Delaware are those of the Dutch and Swedish occupation, and the final struggle against the aggression of the English upon Dutch territory from New Netherland to Cape Henlopen, and the territorial dispute between Penn and Baltimore. It is this early period, more particularly as affecting Sussex, the southern county of Delaware, that is covered by Mr. Turner's volume. The compiler has given a running account of the vicissitudes of the early settlement of Sussex by publishing the original records. The matter is arranged under the following heads, relating roughly to the periods indicated in parentheses: Civil Records (1631-1777), Court Records (1681-1695), Ecclesiastical Records (1791-1852), Miscellaneous Records (1662-1848), and Bible Records (1683-1876).

As the bare enumeration will show, the records contain material relating to all phases of life in Sussex during the earlier periods. While the material comes down in some instances to the nineteenth century, it relates for the most part to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The text of the records is given in the original orthography, and the more valuable on that account. Among the more interesting matter of the civil records are the conveyance of land to the Mennonites for the Swanendael colony at Lewes, the account of troubles with the Virginians at Whorekill (1672), and the change of the name to Sussex.

The court records, beginning with the second entry of the record-book, "the first being well faded out", fill a hundred pages, closely printed, and contain an important account of the life of the county for a period of fifteen years. An interesting parallel might be drawn between the Sussex court records and the Chester court records recently published. This part of the book is perhaps the most important. The ecclesiastical records are very miscellaneous, including the records of St. John's parish, grave-stone inscriptions in St. Matthew's chapel, Cedar Creek Hundred, copies of letters from Thomas Crawford, reports and letters of William Black and William Becket, a list of subscriptions to buy William Becket a farm (1732), letters of Rev. Mr. Usher of Lewes, and the like.

The compiler has rendered an important service in printing old Bible records which are an important source for genealogists. Under this heading of Bible records is included the highly interesting diary or journal entitled "*Aletta Clarke's Book*", beginning April 28, 1789, and continuing through a number of years. The value of this important contribution to the history of Delaware could have been enhanced by more specific reference to the character of the sources and the places where they are to be found. All Blue Hen's Chickens, however, will be grateful to the compiler for his labors in this part of the history of Delaware.

M. D. LEARNED.

John Foster, the Earliest American Engraver and the First Boston Printer. By Samuel Abbott Green. (Published by the Massachusetts Historical Society at the Charge of the Waterston Fund, no. 2, 1909, pp. 149.) In this latest of his many historical works Dr. Green presents in attractive and authoritative fashion the main facts about this very interesting figure in Massachusetts history. Foster's publications appeared in the years 1675-1681 and are of extreme interest to the student of early New England history, as well as to the bibliographer. Many of Foster's imprints have in recent years brought large sums on the rare occasions when they have been sold; the most striking example being the sale of Benjamin Tompson's *New England's Crisis* (1676). One copy of this work is mentioned by Dr. Green as owned by the Boston Athenaeum. This copy, although lacking the title-page, is assigned by Dr. Green to the list of books probably printed by Foster. In the Sotheby sale of June 28, 1910, a copy of this rare work was sold to Mr. Quaritch for £195. Other noteworthy sales are Increase Mather's *The Wicked Man's Portion* (1675), said to be the first book printed in Boston, which brought two hundred and fifty dollars at the Hurst sale in 1904; Increase Mather's *A Brief History of the War with the Indians* (1676), the Brinley copy of which was sold for two hundred and sixty dollars in 1879. The collection of the late John A. Lewis, now in the possession of the Boston Public Library, contains the greater part of Foster's publications, including some of exceeding rarity, as for instance *The Wicked Man's Portion* and Hubbard's *Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians* (1677), with the extremely rare "White Hills" map. Although the Boston Public Library leads the list of libraries with large collections of Foster's imprints, both the Massachusetts Historical Society and the American Antiquarian Society have nearly as large a number.

Several good reproductions and facsimiles add interest to Dr. Green's work, while the bibliographies and indexes are deserving of high praise.

Journals of the Continental Congress. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by Gaillard Hunt, Chief, Division of Manuscripts. Volumes XVII., XVIII., 1780, May 8-September 6, September 7-December 29. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910, pp. 415-808, 809-1270.) The sixteenth volume was noticed in our last issue (XVI. 174). The rate of production is now three volumes a year. Among the most important matters in the present volumes are: the commissioning of John Adams to raise a loan in the Netherlands, June 20, and to make a treaty, December 29, and of Francis Dana as minister to Russia, December 19; the overhauling of the Treasury Board, and the report of the committee criticizing it, August 25, which, with the subsequent action of November 24, led toward the substitution of the single Superintendent of Finance in the next year; the reorganizing of several military departments, the quartermaster-general's, July 15, the inspector-general's, September 25, the general hospital, September 30;

the instructions to Jay regarding the Mississippi, October; and numberless attempts to deal with the finances of the Confederation. The third (eighteenth) volume has a good index for the whole of 1780.

Colonial Precedents of our National Land System as it Existed in 1800. By Amelia Clewley Ford. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin No. 352.] (Madison, Wis., 1910, pp. 157.) Through an extensive study of the colonial sources Miss Ford has found precedents for the following features of the national land system: the rectangular surveys of townships, the six hundred and forty acre section, the revenue policy regarding land, the offering of land bounties, the granting of pre-emption rights, and the reservation of natural resources. As the material is well organized and the argument carefully summed up the work should be of real service to students of the colonial and early national periods of our history. To the special student the book will be of interest because of the reasons advanced for believing Colonel Bouquet himself to have been the author of the "military papers" appended to the account of his expedition of 1765, rather than Thomas Hutchins who has usually been so credited. Another topic, of more general interest, is that of the service rendered by Thomas Jefferson in the establishment of the national land system. At one time it was believed that as he was the author of the proposed land ordinance of 1784 he was entitled to the credit for the excellent system adopted in 1785. But when students began to recognize the similarity between the colonial and the national land systems a tendency then appeared to minimize the work of Jefferson and to found the system upon the colonial precedents rather than upon his plan of 1784. Miss Ford has taken a middle ground, her conclusion being that "the system of rectangular surveys was therefore a gradual evolution under conditions peculiar to American colonial life, modified in regard to boundary lines by the reforming doctrinaire mind of Jefferson" (p. 82).

In handling so many statements of fact it is natural that errors should creep in. A few have been noted, but they are of details. It may be questioned, however, whether a single resolution introduced in Congress by Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, to permit the use of natural boundaries in "particular cases" where the rectangular lines were inadvisable "proves that the peculiar excellence of the national township system—the checkerboard arrangement of lines—was not contributed by New England" (p. 75).

The study is a careful and valuable one. It is a pity that an index was not provided to render the many facts more available.

PAYSON J. TREAT.

La Conjura de Aaron Burr y las Primeras Tentativas de Conquista de México por Americanos del Oeste. Monografía por V. Salado Álvarez, Miembro Correspondiente de la Academia Mexicana y Socio de Número del Liceo Altamirano. (Mexico, Museo Nacional, 1908, pp.

viii, 64.) This is a monograph dealing with the Aaron Burr Conspiracy. Señor Álvarez has gone over part of the ground, having delved in the archives at Washington and Mexico. He unearths, however, no new fact of particular consequence, and arrives at the conclusion that the Burr enterprise aimed only at the conquest of Mexico. He bases his discussion in large part on the work of McCaleb—*The Aaron Burr Conspiracy*. Full bibliographical references are given. The chief value of the study lies in the fact that Mexican students are beginning to look at some of our larger problems from the other side. Many of us have never realized that there were two sides to the medal.

State Banking before the Civil War, by Davis R. Dewey, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and *The Safety Fund Banking System in New York, 1829-1866*, by Robert E. Chaddock, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. [Senate Document no. 581, 61st Congress, 2d session.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910, pp. 388.) The National Monetary Commission has performed a good service in providing students and the general public with these two excellent compendiums of a subject, or two allied subjects, important in our economic history. Within recent years a considerable number of monographs on the history of state banking in the various states have been published, prepared either as doctoral dissertations or under the auspices of the Department of Economic Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Upon the basis laid down by these and by extensive study of the early reports and other original materials, Professor Dewey has constructed a survey which is systematic as distinguished from the chronological or geographical order, and in which, under twenty-eight general heads and a number of subheads, all aspects of state banking before the institution of the national bank system are so set forth that they can be readily apprehended and their lessons drawn. This, very compactly written, fills rather more than half the volume. The remainder is occupied with Professor Chaddock's sound and thorough survey of the history of the New York regulating system.

Abraham Lincoln: an American Migration. Family English not German. By Marion Dexter Learned, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literature of the University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia, William J. Campbell, 1909, pp. xii, 149.) The purpose of this book is to disprove the contention set forth by Louis P. Hennighausen in the *Report* for 1901 of the Society of the History of the Germans of Maryland, that Abraham Lincoln was descended from a German family originally settled in Pennsylvania, and spelling its name Linkhorn. This purpose is so effectually accomplished that that theory can never again be seriously entertained. The method employed is that of giving documentary evidence of the migration of Lincoln's ancestors from England to Massachusetts, and thence to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky. This evidence is for the most part here printed, much

is given by photographic reproduction, and it is supplemented by illustrations of various Lincoln homesteads. Chapter VIII., pages 130 to 134, discusses the various forms of the name found in these documents, and clinches the argument by giving a contemporary emendation of a court record stating that "Linkhorn" was properly "Lincoln".

In working out his primary purpose the author has in addition made a valuable contribution to the history of American immigration. The reviewer is not aware of any other continuous family movement so profusely illustrated by printed documents. The procession of motives is clear at nearly every point, though not perhaps to quite the extent claimed by the author in his concluding chapter. A connection between the Lincolns and the Boones is established, and though the author seems to make it closer than the documents warrant, its sentimental value should offset some of the picturesque episodes that scientific history has been demolishing.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

John Lothrop Motley and his Family: Further Letters and Records. Edited by his Daughter and Herbert St. John Mildmay. (London and New York, John Lane, 1910, pp. xi, 321.) Next after Lowell, Motley was the best of American letter-writers, and a supplement to the *Correspondence* published in 1889 deserves to be welcomed. Some of the letters from his pen in the present volume, particularly of the Civil War period, rank with the best of those embraced in the earlier series, but most do not. The correspondence with Bismarck is decidedly interesting. Most of the volume, however, is made up of letters by other members of Motley's family, chiefly his wife and his eldest daughter, afterward Lady Harcourt. Mrs. Motley, so obscured in the earlier collection that it does not even give her full name, was a woman of intelligence and cultivation, whose letters respecting London social life in the fifties have considerable interest. More sprightly, and perhaps better, are those of Miss Lily Motley describing Vienna diplomatic life in the sixties. There are excellent and interesting illustrations, chiefly portraits.

History of Crises under the National Banking System. By O. M. W. Sprague, Assistant Professor of Banking and Finance in Harvard University. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910, pp. v, 484.) This report is devoted to a study of the operations of the national banks during the crisis of 1873, the panic of May, 1884, the financial stringency of 1890, the crisis of 1893, and the crisis of 1907, the first and last occupying by far the largest portion of space. Owing to the variety of disturbing factors which influence commercial conditions, it is extremely difficult to apportion the responsibility when panics arise. The deep-rooted inclination to speculate which characterizes the American people, the patchwork system of currency, and the operations of banks are all important elements which have to be taken into account. It is natural that banking authorities should be disposed to place the

responsibility for disaster upon the first two of the above factors, and for the most part financial students have followed their example. Professor Sprague, however, has concentrated his attention upon the national banks, and endeavored to determine whether with the imperfect tools they had at their command, they did their work as well as could be expected. He studies their loans, deposits, cash reserves, circulation; he is not content with treating the banks as a whole, or even by customary geographical groupings, but pursues the analysis more intensively to the operations of individual banks. He reaches the "depressing conclusion that the banking situation in 1907 was handled less skilfully and boldly than in 1893, and far less so than in 1873". The study is based upon a most careful use of documents, newspapers, and statistical returns; one hundred and fifty pages are given to reprints of important material, and there is a most serviceable index of over twenty pages.

D. R. D.

Leona Vicario, Heroína Insurgente. Por Genaro García. (Mexico, Museo Nacional de Arqueología, 1910, pp. 11, 210.) So little has been done in the history of the revolution of Mexico that the story of Leona Vicario can but be applauded. Señor García has given us a fairly well-drawn biographical study of the famous heroine. On account of uncovering new materials he has been enabled to excel the sketch of her by Bustamante, who so much admired her. Also it may be said that Sosa and Barquera in their brief studies have been totally eclipsed.

The most important document unearthed is the journal of the trial of Leona, which in itself is a volume, and more or less biographical. The details elucidated are instructive, particularly as relates to the functions of Church and State and the manner in which the individual was articulated to society.

The life of Leona Vicario is traced from the beginning with some reference to her antecedents, giving us a description of the educational modes of her time and the part played by religion. The chapters devoted to her later studies, her independent reading, the books which were available and popular at that time, are interesting.

A glimpse is given of the family relation, and of the early love affairs of Leona. It was just at the blossoming time when she became a thorough convert to the revolutionary propaganda. One of the inspiring sheets which helped in her conversion was the *Seminario Patriótico Americano*; also she had access to numbers of volumes of French literature, which at that time was so thoroughly saturated with the fumes of the revolution. Once she had thoroughly espoused the cause of the Mexicans she did not hesitate to resort to whatever extremity the occasion warranted. She aided and abetted the revolutionists in every possible way, forwarding their mails, and furnishing them with money—even at the expense of her jewelry—and provisions, as far as was in her power. Of course it was only a question of time until the minions of the government got track of her and ran her down. The story of her vicissitudes, imprisonment, flight, capture, trial, is fascinating.

What with the materials at hand and the inspiring subject the author might easily have made a better book, for Señor García wields a facile pen. The most sweeping criticism lies upon his not clinging more closely to his subject, as, for instance, when he is led for a time at the chariot-wheel of Señor Obregon.

The book is carefully printed and is embellished with a number of appropriate illustrations; bibliographical citations are numerous. The book is a further evidence that Mexico is rapidly developing a school of writers, with modern conceptions of the essentials and with higher ideals.

W. F. M.

La Intervención Francesa en México segun el Archivo del Mariscal Bazaine. Octava Parte y Novena Parte. [Documentos Inéditos ó muy Raros para la Historia de México, edited by Genaro García. Tomos XXVII. y XXX.] (Mexico, Bouret, 1909, 1910, pp. 264, 264.) The eighth and ninth parts of this series of documents selected from manuscripts of Marshal Bazaine and published in Mexico under the editorship of Señor García, cover the periods from March 7 to May 26 and May 28 to September 9 of 1865. The volumes contain seventy-one and eighty-three documents respectively, forty-one of which are over the signature of Bazaine, seven being reports to the French Minister of War on general military and political affairs. This selection gives an average of less than two documents a week emanating from the chief administrator of a large army of occupation with important civil functions. This relative paucity of material may be due merely to the nature of the archives accessible to the editor (he does not explain the point) but the fact suggests the incompleteness of the collection, and also perhaps accounts for the disappointing lack of new information.

The relation of the United States to the situation in Mexico assumes a new importance in the period now reached in these papers. Bazaine discusses the subject regularly in each of his reports to the Minister of War, and there are many communications on the topic to and from subordinates and from Maximilian's officials. These latter documents furnish some new evidence to confirm the already familiar opinion that the triumph of the federal cause greatly encouraged the enemies of the French intervention and added men and arms to their feeble forces. Yet the official point of view still continued to be that no overt hostility was expected from the government of the United States, even when prudent measures were being discussed to meet possible invasions from the north bank of the Rio Grande.

Here one finds recorded Bazaine's criticism of projects of general administrative reform of the empire by Maximilian. Explanations of press prosecutions, censures of rampant party spirit, reports of manifestations against Belgian and Austrian troops, semi-apologetic accounts of disorders in various districts, all illustrate the substantial difficulties which beset the imperial government. Bazaine then begins to receive instructions to prepare for the termination of the intervention within a

reasonable time. Some interesting light is thrown upon plans for colonization of confederates and of French-speaking people from California, and upon the vague ambitions of Gwin under the favor of Napoleon.

For the first time Señor García gives his readers, in the ninth volume, a brief explanation of his editorial method in marking his own additions to documents, the lacunae in the originals, etc. The information is belated but welcome. Why may he not give similar explanations on other points previously noted in these reviews?

C. A. DUNIWAY.

TEXT-BOOKS

Reading References for English History. By Henry Lewin Cannon, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Leland Stanford Junior University. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1910, pp. xv, 559.) Mr. Cannon assumed a tremendously difficult task when he undertook to write this book, and it must be said that he has accomplished it surprisingly well. He has furnished a bibliography of English history which is indispensable for the teacher of English history both in school and in college. The method he has followed, though at first sight apparently confusing, is an excellent one. He has done a service of great value in giving a bibliography not only of English historical works but of poems and novels bearing on English history. Especially commendable are his references to maps in the books mentioned in the second part of his work, which is given up to topics and references.

Opinions will differ as to the writer's duty to give some critical appreciation of the books included in his bibliography. In my own opinion, he should have done this, at least to the extent of starring those books which in his judgment were the best. Opinions will differ, too, about the value of the books in this list. On the whole, the selection is excellent, but I should not have included Hume's *History of England* in six volumes, while I should have mentioned Brewer's one-volume edition of Hume. I should omit Wishart's *Monck*, Palgrave's *Cromwell*, Smyth's *Lectures*, Duruy's *Modern Times*, and Häusser's *Reformation*. On the other hand, the following books ought to be included: Vinogradoff's *Growth of the Manor*, Mrs. Lomas's edition of Carlyle's *Cromwell*, Stainer's *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, Foxcroft's *Life and Letters of Sir George Savile*, Tout's *Advanced History of Great Britain*, and there should be a mention of the last editions of Dahlmann-Waitz and of Taswell-Langmead.

The work has been done with unusual accuracy. There are a few errors, for the most part typographical. It is Putzger and not "Putzgers", Hassall and not "Hassal" (p. 75), Montalembert and not "Montlembert" (p. 175). Let me add that in my opinion initials should be given in addition to the authors' names in the reference lists, or, if this is not practicable, they should at least be given when the name is a common one.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

American Government and Politics. By Charles A. Beard, Associate Professor of Politics in Columbia University. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1910, pp. viii, 772.) With his own untiring industry, and with the earnest co-operation of almost a dozen of his colleagues and friends, Professor Beard has very capably accomplished his purpose of a compilation from "the best authorities of recent times" for giving an exposition of our public life. For the enormous masses of facts and figures he has gathered, he has relied on secondary aids, as it would have been physically impossible to go to the original sources himself, and unnecessary to do so as he has chosen the safest guides, such as Wilson, Goodnow, Moore, Reinsch, Foster, Bryce, Cooley, and others. He has been impartial, rarely injecting his own views into the text, so no one need look here for striking comments or for innovating suggestions. Occasionally he inclines very gently from his balance as when he condemns our complicated system of officers and elections.

Although "designed for college students", it is rather hard to see how the book can be very useful pedagogically. It is crowded with too many details to serve as a continuous text-book, while many of the laws and statistics are too quickly superseded for the volume to be satisfactory as a reference repository for more than a brief period. For the latter object, too, the index should be much longer. In spite of the author's care there are also some shortcomings of statement: "water carriage" (p. 415) in this country is not "much cheaper than transportation by rail" except for a few heavy, bulky articles. The two meanings of "impeachment" in the United States Constitution are not sufficiently contrasted (p. 264). In many cases he has failed to state how statutes have been modified or even nullified by the courts. The law limiting hours of labor (p. 734) for women is a case in point, being both in force and not in force at present in this land. But for a rapid summary of past conditions and for a flash-light picture of the present chaos of our governmental machinery, the work is unsurpassed.

COLYER MERIWETHER.

A History of the United States for Schools. By S. E. Forman. (New York, The Century Company, 1910, pp. xiii, 419, lxxi.) Mr. Forman has the rare courage of breaking away from routine so as to give us a volume developing, in the main, one conception. Instead of trying to summarize all our past, he presents us as an expanding organism germinating on the Atlantic and spreading westward to the Philippines. He attempts to set out in proper perspective the chief steps in our progress. His pages teem with those forms and results of action that make for growth, industrial, social, intellectual, not the details of military campaigns. Of his forty-five chapters, nearly every heading carries the idea of vivid human movement. For arousing the interest of his audience, young people in school, no purpose could be wiser for that age. From the pedagogical standpoint they are also furnished a thread on which to string the pearls they find in their journey. Start-

ing of course with the discovery of America, the author devotes over a hundred pages, or about one-fourth of the whole, to the colonies to 1776, then two hundred down to the Civil War, with the remaining hundred to the present. Certainly this is all the familiar ground covered by dozens of other school texts, but there is the difference of treatment. Leaving out the usual mass of facts, names, and dates, he clings to his main thesis, choosing the things that best strengthen and illustrate it, all expressed in a very clear, simple, attractive style.

But there are some defects to be noted. At times he weakens in his own faith, and frankly admits that he digresses from "the subject of the Westward Movement" in order to relate the "story of national affairs" (p. 221), wandering into political struggles that he could have linked with his central topic but does not. Again he seems unaware of the geographical influences shaping our destinies. Even on such a cogent example as the Erie Canal, he says not one word about the natural advantages of the route selected. He should have made some explanation of the excess of exports over imports (p. 413). Instead of the fourteen pages of Great Subjects, he should let the students work out such matters from the index themselves. The Roman pagination for seventy-one pages, at the end, is to be unqualifiedly condemned for a class-room work. But all in all, with the fine maps and pictures, if not the best United States school history, there is surely none better.

COLYER MERIWETHER.

The History of Political Theory and Party Organization in the United States. By Simeon D. Fess, LL.D., President of Antioch College. (Boston and New York, Ginn and Company, 1910, pp. vi, 451.) Dr. Fess bases his work on the thesis that political parties and political theories in this country rest on the very elements of human nature. There have been, he maintains, many kaleidoscopic changes of garb and nomenclature but at bottom there have been only two contesting principles in our public struggles, whether we call them radicalism and conservatism, strict construction and loose construction, liberty and authority, states' rights and nationalism, centralization and decentralization. Similarly, though names have changed, platforms have been modified, utterances have been revised and attitudes have been reversed, we have had but two parties throughout our life of one hundred and twenty years. Still more remarkable, these two foes have equally divided that stretch of time. "The old Republican and the modern Democratic party" are one and the same, while "the Federalist, the National Republican, the Whig, and the Republican" (of to-day), differ only in title (p. 437).

For developing his theme, the author skilfully pilots us through the mazes of enunciations and deliverances of individuals and groups, from the formation of the Union down, sticking logically to his subject all the time. The great figures in this long drama pass before us, the per-

formances of each being succinctly reviewed, the whole furnishing a very handy, compact narrative of our political life. Some of the best parts of the book are those dealing with the philosophical relations between politics and natural conditions, as in the differences of view between the up-country and low-country in South Carolina (p. 108).

But Benton did not get the resolution of censure of Jackson expunged in one year (p. 157), it took him three years. Johnson could hardly be called "extravagant" in the use of the veto (p. 382) when we recall Cleveland's prodigality with that weapon.

COLYER MERIWETHER.

COMMUNICATIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

My dear Sir:

ON October 18, after reading Mr. J. H. Smith's criticism (in the October number of the REVIEW) of my book, *British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846*, I addressed to you a letter of protest. In your reply of October 27, you state that "the pages of the REVIEW are always open to writers of books who wish to reply to reviews of their volumes, provided they confine themselves, as you would be disposed to do, to questions of fact."

After considerable hesitation I have concluded to avail myself of this privilege, as I believe Mr. Smith's review should not pass without comment. My book is not an important one. It merely presents the lectures delivered at Johns Hopkins University, and is no doubt deficient in literary form. But Mr. Smith's review is important, if open-minded justice is still requisite to a fair review. As a preliminary to an examination of the review it should be stated that, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Smith and I are the only students who have read and made transcripts from the manuscript material on Texas, in the British Public Record Office.

Mr. Smith writes that my book "contains numerous errors", and cites twenty-one such "simple cases". Two are absolute errors. Of the nineteen other alleged errors, not differentiated, and so stated as to appear of equal gravity and to reflect equally upon the author, three are instances of carelessness of statement; *e. g.*, Mr. Smith writes: "On page 61 the signing of the Anglo-Texan treaties is correctly stated to have taken place in 1840, but on page 93 this is placed among the events of 1842." It is true that on page 93, near the bottom, "signing" is inaccurately and carelessly used for ratification. In the sentence immediately preceding, however, ratification is used, and on pages 67, 72, 75, 76, 78, 85, 86, the narrative is plainly occupied with the preparations for ratification and the correct word is used, and on page 87 is the following: "... on June 28 those treaties were finally ratified. . . ." On

page 93 the word "signing" is regrettable, but a misunderstanding of fact is impossible, and the review is clearly misleading.

To sixteen of the twenty-one allegations of error I object. Six of them are really differences between Mr. Smith and myself as to the meaning of certain documents. They are differences of interpretation—neither errors nor contradictions. Most of these refer to documents in the British Public Record Office (known apparently only to Mr. Smith and myself) and obviously impossible to quote at length in illustration of my objection. But, fortunately, Mr. Smith catalogues one such "error", the bearing of which and the document will be well known to every student of American history. He says, "Page 13: 'at the time there was little question, save in extreme abolition circles, that the allegations of Calhoun [in his correspondence with Pakenham, touching British interference in Texas] had some foundation in fact'; but, as Calhoun merely asserted on that subject what Aberdeen had avowed, the foundation of his 'allegations' was beyond question (*Sen. Doc. No. 341*, 28 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 50, 65)." Everyone knows this document and is aware that Calhoun attributed certain objects and a certain plan to Great Britain, and offered Aberdeen's words to support his allegations. They also know that Aberdeen denied Calhoun's interpretation. Mr. Smith accepts the latter. Indeed, he outdoes Calhoun, who writes, in this document, that he "infers" from Aberdeen's avowal a certain line of diplomacy. Here, Mr. Smith catalogues as an "error" (and without explanation or qualification) what is really a difference of interpretation, and then cites in support of his accusation the very document which we interpret differently.

Another of Mr. Smith's cases of error, not a matter of interpretation, is the following: "Page 145: Aberdeen's note to Ashbel Smith 'disclaimed any intention of interfering in Texan affairs'; but the note added the qualification 'improperly', on which a world of meaning could hang." The charge here is of incorrect citation, and consequent wrong conclusion—a serious charge, and based wholly upon the correctness of Mr. Smith's own notes. I had felt reasonably confident of my own accuracy, but for convincing proof, wrote immediately to my copyist in London for another transcript of Aberdeen's note to Ashbel Smith of September 11, 1843. This transcript reached me on the 15th inst., and is exactly as I have given it on pages 144–145 of the book. The word "improperly" does *not* appear in the note. (Transcript certified by W. H. Powell, 1 Arkell's Villas, Washington Road, Worcester Park, Surrey, England, November 3, 1910.) Now, in fact, the word "improper", or "improperly", in this connection occurs once on it is each time in reference to communications from Ashbel Smith to Aberdeen or to Jones, not from Aberdeen to Ashbel Smith. It does *not* appear in the note from Aberdeen to Ashbel Smith.

The remaining nine alleged errors are misrepresentations. To illus-

trate: "Page 80: 'throughout his career at the Mexican capital Pakenham very accurately reflected the attitude of the government at home'; but on page 123 he is said to have decided to take no action on certain definite instructions." Mr. Smith implies here that I have used the word "reflected" to mean that Pakenham accurately reflected his instructions by carrying out those instructions, and then, that I contradict this generalization by citing a specific instance when he failed to do so. The *entire sentence* on page 80, following an analysis of Aberdeen's change of policy toward Mexico, differing from that of Palmerston, is, as follows: "The change of tone in British policy is indicated by the change of tone in Pakenham's reports, for throughout his career at the Mexican capital, Pakenham very accurately reflected the attitude of the government at home." I do not think many readers would misunderstand the kind of "reflection" intended, in a sentence where the word "reports" is thus used, or regard this as in contradiction to the statement made about Pakenham some forty pages later, on page 123.

Again, Mr. Smith writes, "Page 131: Houston 'argued most vigorously against Santa Anna's proposal for an armistice'; but the British chargé wrote at this time (April 14, 1843) that Houston considered an armistice 'indispensably necessary.' (F. O. Texas, VI.) What he objected to was the idea that the armistice should be followed with an acknowledgment of Mexican sovereignty." Here, Mr. Smith has merely written what I myself wrote of Santa Anna's offer, and yet conveys the impression that I did not know the facts. Three pages before the sentence, a portion of which is quoted by Mr. Smith, I state (p. 128) Santa Anna's armistice overture to be based on a plan of Texan "reannexation to Mexico on terms of local self-government and nominal Mexican sovereignty. Santa Anna commissioned Robinson to make overtures along these lines to the Texas government. . . ."

Again; "The author explains (p. 152) that Elliot's 'only comfort [on hearing that the United States had suggested annexation] lay in the non-committal attitude of Texas and the evident intention of Houston to postpone action'; but why did Elliot forget that (*e. g.*, p. 155) he believed Houston sincerely desired to prevent annexation?" It might be replied that, in any logically constructed work, Elliot, on page 152 (December, 1843), could not very well be accused of forgetting what is postulated of him on page 155 (January, 1844). The fact is, however, as I show, that Elliot's belief in Houston was established long before December, 1843, but that in his dismay at the United States' overture on annexation, he did, for a few weeks, distrust Houston's ability to hold Texas in check. I particularly try to show that Elliot *did forget*, but Mr. Smith's statement would indicate that I forgot, and was guilty of contradiction.

It is probably unnecessary to give further illustrations of the nature of the review though I could readily do so. Those I have already given, with such brevity as has seemed possible, should indicate my point.

Believing that I have confined myself to facts, and thanking you for space, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

My dear Sir:

I HAVE examined attentively and with sympathy Professor Adams's letter and think that a few simple remarks may clear up the issues. (1) In order to put the reader on his guard respecting certain matters too large to be discussed in the review of his book, it seemed necessary to suggest that all due care had not been used by the author; and the incorrect stating of a fact was an error and a pertinent consideration even though a correct statement of it could somewhere be found. (2) The author does not distinguish between Calhoun's "allegations" regarding British interference in Texas and Calhoun's declarations regarding the state of Tyler's mind on that subject. (3) According to my notes as well as his, the word "improperly" does not occur in the draft of Aberdeen's letter of September 11 to Smith; but such a qualification was a characteristic—indeed essential—feature of British assurances with regard to interfering in Texas, and a trained investigator who, as I had good reason to believe, examined the letter itself, reported the word. The concurrence of probability and testimony appeared fairly convincing. (4) At a certain date the policy of the British government was to work for peace between Mexico and Texas, but Pakenham when instructed to execute that policy declined to do so. Now did his disobedience or his report that he had disobeyed reflect "very accurately the attitude" represented by his instructions? (5) In February, 1843, Santa Anna proposed through Robinson that Texas accept substantial autonomy with nominal allegiance to Mexico. Against this plan Houston argued. In May Santa Anna proposed through Doyle a sort of armistice. This proposal was primarily due to Houston's earnest though indirect exertions, and obviously it was a mistake to say that he opposed it. (6) As early as February 15, 1843, Elliot became satisfied that Houston desired the permanent independence of Texas; and this belief, strongly reaffirmed in the very despatch (October 31, 1843, secret) in which he reported that the United States had made an annexation overture, was always—in view of Houston's great influence and great political skill—a reasonable ground of hope and comfort, however doubtful popular sentiment, until Houston yielded to pressure in the latter part of April or the first days of May, 1845. (7) As for the residuary complaint, misrepresentation, it would be impossible to prove a negative in the space you could be asked to give me, and the failure to establish an instance is a further reason for not attempting it. Nor is this quite all. Great pains were taken—possibly not with success in every case—to understand and correctly represent the passages cited;

under the circumstances any other aim would have been inconsistent not merely with honesty but with even a low grade of simple human intelligence; and if writing is so done that a painstaking reader misunderstands it, the fault can hardly be charged to him. There are sentences in the book to which I returned again and again in order to determine their precise meaning. (8) Of course Professor Adams's name and position show that his book represents after all a deal of earnest scholarly work. Possibly, as my review was overrunning its limit, I took it rather too much for granted that no proof of this was necessary. Here, and not in the points brought forward by him, there may perhaps be a ground for criticizing the critic.

Respectfully yours,

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

NOTES AND NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Page-proofs of the second volume of the *Annual Report* for 1908 have been read; the index is being prepared. The *Annual Report* for 1909, one volume, will shortly be set up. Besides the material coming from the last annual meeting, it will contain the annual bibliography of books and articles in American history hitherto published under the title *Writings on American History*. The *Annual Report* for 1910 will contain, in volume I., the material derived from the Indianapolis meeting, that from the meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch, the annual bibliography for 1910, and reports of the Public Archives Commission on the archives of Indiana, Kentucky, and Nebraska. For the last-named commission, Professor Charles M. Andrews has undertaken to prepare, from the official materials in the Public Record Office, a list of governors' commissions and instructions and of representations of the Board of Trade. The Committee on Bibliography expects soon to have ready its list of volumes of historical sources in American libraries. The Report of the Committee of Five on History in Secondary Schools will shortly be published by the Macmillan Company in two forms, separately and in conjunction with the Report of the Committee of Seven which it reviews.

The biennial *Handbook* of the Association will be compiled and printed during the early part of the present year. Members are urgently requested to supply the secretary with such data respecting their degrees, academic or other positions, addresses, etc., as they wish to have included in the published list of members.

Mr. Notestein's Adams prize essay on the History of Witchcraft in England will before long be sent to the press.

The Pacific Coast Branch held its annual meeting at Berkeley, November 18 and 19. The presidential address by Professor E. D. Adams was on the Point of View of the British Traveller in America, 1819-1860. Papers were read on the Place of the Utah Pioneers in Western History, by Professor Levi E. Young, on the Attitude of Congress toward the Pacific Railway, by Professor A. M. Kline, on Oregon Pioneers and American Diplomacy, by Professor Joseph Schafer, and on various other topics in European and American history. Professor Bernard Moses was elected president, and Mr. H. W. Edwards of the Oakland High School, secretary and treasurer.

An annual bibliography of American history, prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, has for three years been published by the Macmillan

Company, at the cost of a group of subscribing societies and individuals, under the titles, *Writings on American History*, 1906, 1907, 1908, continuing the *Writings on American History*, 1903, published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington. That the permanence of this valuable implement of research may be assured, the American Historical Association, already one of the subscribing societies, has resolved to include the bibliography for 1909 and subsequent years in its *Annual Reports* for those years. The existing volumes will, for the present, continue to be published by the Macmillan Company. The material for 1909 is completed, that for 1910 partially so.

In the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History* the volume of *Narratives of Early Maryland*, edited by Mr. Clayton C. Hall of the Maryland Historical Society, was published in October. The volume entitled *Narratives of Early Carolina*, edited by Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., is now in press. To announcements previously made it is now possible to add that of a volume of *Narratives of the Insurrections of 1689* (and Bacon's Rebellion), to be edited by Professor Charles M. Andrews of Yale University.

PERSONAL

Count Albert Vandal, member of the French Academy, and professor in the École Libre des Sciences Politiques, died August 30, aged fifty-seven. His chief works were, *Louis XV. et Élisabeth de Russie* (1882); *Napoléon et Alexandre I^{er}* (1891, 1893, 1896); and *L'Avènement de Bonaparte* (1902, 1903).

Professor Karl Daendliker of Zurich died September 14, at the age of sixty-one. Besides his *Geschichte der Schweiz* (Zurich, 1884-1887), perhaps the most widely esteemed of general histories of Switzerland, he had published the first two volumes (1908, 1909) of a most valuable *Geschichte der Stadt und des Kantons Zürich*; the third and final volume may have been left so nearly complete as to warrant publication.

The late Henry Harrisse bequeathed about 150 volumes and pamphlets of his own works, annotated by himself, and a small number of valuable maps, to the Library of Congress.

Professor Charles M. Andrews lectures at the University of Wisconsin in January, and is to give a course of lectures on American colonial history at the University of Helsingfors in October, 1911.

Dr. H. M. Klein has been made professor of history at Franklin and Marshall College.

The regents of the University of Arizona have advanced Mr. H. A. E. Chandler from the position of assistant professor in history and economics to that of professor of economics and history.

Professor Herbert E. Bolton of Stanford University has accepted a call to the University of California, to serve as professor of American history from July 1 next.

Mr. W. L. Grant, hitherto Beit lecturer on colonial history in the University of Oxford, has been made professor of colonial and Canadian history at Queen's University, Kingston. The Rev. John Dall of Rothesay, Scotland, has been made professor of church history in the same institution.

GENERAL

A "Universal Races Congress" will be held in London on July 26-29, 1911. Its object is "to discuss, in the light of modern knowledge and the modern conscience, the general relations subsisting between the peoples of the West and those of the East, between so-called white and so-called colored peoples, with a view to encouraging between them a fuller understanding, the most friendly feelings, and a heartier co-operation". The programme provides for the consideration of such subjects as anthropological and social views of race, race equality, national autonomy and civic responsibility, the influence of geographic, economic, and political conditions, the position of women, tendencies toward parliamentary rule, the government of colonies and dependencies, inter-racial economics, the influence of missions, the African problem, the negro in America, the mixed races of Brazil, etc. The president of the congress is Lord Weardale, the general secretary, to whom all inquiries should be addressed, is Mr. G. Spiller, 63 South Hill Park, Hampstead, London.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Company expect to publish about February 1 the first issue, covering the year 1910, of the *American Year Book: a Record of Events and Progress*. Representatives of twenty-nine of the great national learned societies act as a supervisory board, with Professor A. B. Hart as chairman. The managing editor is Mr. S. N. D. North, formerly the director of the United States Census. The book will be a royal octavo volume of about eight hundred pages, and is intended to contain in systematic order an adequate account of American events and progress in all the great fields of activity. The main divisions will be comparative statistics, history and law, government and administration, functions of government, economics and social questions, industries and occupations, science and engineering, the humanities, and a chronological and necrological record. The series is thus adapted to serve as a record of advance in a wide variety of fields, with chief but not exclusive reference to American affairs.

Just before his death M. Léopold Delisle had prepared, at the instance of M. Honoré Champion, a twofold guide for cataloguers, of manuscripts and of early printed books, which is now published under the title *Instructions pour la Rédaction d'un Catalogue de Manuscrits et pour la Rédaction d'un Inventaire des Incunables conservés dans les Bibliothèques Publiques de France* (Paris, Champion, 1910, pp. 99). The text, a product of unrivalled experience, and the illustrative

examples, 50 in the first section, 116 in the second, are well worthy the attention of medievalists who are not themselves cataloguers.

The manual for the classification and description of archives prepared by the Dutch archivists, Drs. Muller, Feith, and Fruin, best known by its German translation by Dr. Hans Kaiser (1905), under the title *Anleitung zum Ordnen und Beschreiben von Archiven*, has been translated into French and adapted to the use of French and Belgian archivists, by Messrs. Henri Stein, of the Archives Nationales, and Joseph Cuvelier, of the Archives Générales of Belgium, with a preface by Professor Pirenne of the University of Ghent. The title of the translation is *Manuel pour le Classement et la Description des Archives* (Hague, A. de Jager, 1910).

The Cambridge University Press have just issued volume XII. of the *Cambridge Modern History*, entitled *The Latest Age*. This completes the work, save that a volume of maps and one of lists and general index will be added.

The publication of the fiftieth volume of *Schulthess' Europäischer Geschichtskalender*, founded in 1861, draws special attention to this remarkable publication, still probably the leading one of the kind. H. v. Sybel wrote the introduction for the first volume; the first twenty-five volumes were edited by Schulthess himself, and the list of later editors includes Dr. Ernst Delbrück (1885-1886), Professor H. Delbrück (1887-1893), Dr. Roloff, and Dr. Ludwig Riess.

No one need be without an historical atlas now that Mr. J. M. Dent has brought out an *Atlas of Historical Geography: Europe*, with maps by Bartholomew, in his marvellously cheap series called *Everyman's Library*. There are some forty-five beautifully executed historical maps, small but simple, made with a reasonable amount of scholarship, as many more of modern geography, a score of small battle-maps, a score of maps illustrating literary works, and a hundred pages of well-made gazetteer and index. Similar volumes for America and the other continents are promised.

In a new series of text-books on economics, political science, and sociology, to be issued by the Macmillan Company under the editorship of Professor Richard T. Ely, there is to be a *History of Economic Thought* by Professor L. H. Haney and a *History of Sociological Thought* by President George E. Vincent.

The School of Peace, a foundation due to Mr. Edwin Ginn, has as its executive head President David S. Jordan of Stanford University. Among measures taken by it for the advancement of the peace movement an interesting development is that of a course at that university, in which Professor E. B. Krehbiel will instruct on the historical and statistical aspects of the effects of war.

The publishing house of Kurt Habitzsch, Würzburg, has begun the publication of a series entitled *Darstellungen über Früh- und Vorgeschichtliche Kultur-, Kunst-, und Völkerentwicklung*. Two volumes have appeared under the editorship of Professor Gustaf Kossinna.

Under the title, *De la Méthode dans les Sciences et dans l'Histoire*, Professor A. D. Xenopol of the University of Bucharest has published through F. Bichon and Durand Auzias, Paris, the course of lectures delivered by him in the Collège de France in 1908.

A summary of the results of a wide range of archaeological work is contained in Band 30 of Professor Eduard Heyck's *Monographien zur Weltgeschichte*, under the title *Das Vorgeschichtliche Europa: Kulturen und Völker*, by Dr. Hans Hahne (Bielefeld, Velhagen and Klasing, 1910).

The Gazette Press, Champaign, Illinois, publishes a *Syllabus of Continental European History* by D. H. Lloyd of the Department of History of the University of Illinois, for use in the general introductory course there in European history, medieval and modern. The *Syllabus* is of unusual extent and is marked by a profuse supply of reading lists.

An interesting contribution to methodology appears under the title "Diplomatica e Storia" in the *Annuario del R. Istituto di Studi Superiori* in Florence, 1909-1910. In this Luigi Schiaparelli deals with the methods of research in diplomatic material as compared with those in more general or more varied fields.

The publication of a history of woman's rights is no doubt well timed. G. P. Putnam's Sons have just brought out such a work by Eugene A. Hecker, bearing the title *A Short History of the Progress of Woman's Rights from the Days of Augustus to the Present Time*. The author has examined the status of women among the principal peoples of Europe but he has devoted his study especially to England and the United States and has laid stress on the enlargement of property rights, the growth of educational privileges, and kindred matters, as well as upon the efforts in behalf of woman suffrage.

In Professor Lamprecht's *Beiträge* the thirteenth heft is *Die Darstellung des Individuums in den "Origines de la France Contemporaine" von Taine* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, 1910, pp. 96), by Karl Fritzsche.

The Duke and Duchess of Arcos have presented to Harvard University, in memory of the late Mr. Woodbury Lowery, brother of the duchess, the sum of twenty thousand dollars, the income of which is to be awarded from year to year to some person, preferably an instructor or graduate of Harvard, to enable him to carry on research in historical archives, preferably researches relating to American history in the archives of foreign countries and more particularly in Spain.

Ranke literature has received an addition in Hans F. Helmolt's *Ranke Bibliographie* (Leipzig, Dyksche Buchhandlung, 1910, pp. 65). Eighteen

pages are occupied with the lists of works and translations, and the remainder by "Die Schriften über Ranke"; under this latter head are apparently embraced even quite brief references to Ranke in books on quite other themes—a kind of notice which it is manifest can be only partially represented in this limited space. The author intimates a half-formed intention of proceeding to a biography of Ranke. The publication contains as frontispiece an engraving of Ranke in 1859 referred to by the publishing house as "so gut wie unbekannt".

The sixtieth birthday of Professor Lenz, University of Berlin, was celebrated by a group of friends and pupils with a *Festschrift* bearing the title *Studien und Versuche zur Neuere Geschichte* (Berlin, Gebrüder Paetel, 1910). It contains eight essays by the following: Theodor Brieger, Felix Rachfahl, Paul Haake, Wilhelm Stolze, H. von Kämmerer, Hans Delbrück, Erich Brandenburg, Hermann Oncken.

The sixtieth birthday of Professor Karl Zeumer was celebrated by the publication as *Festgabe* of a volume of historical and juridical studies by pupils and friends (Weimar, H. Böhlau Nachfolger, 1910). The historical contributions are in medieval history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Ferrero, *Storia e Filosofia della Storia* (Nuova Antologia, November); M. Rosenthal, *Tendenzen der Entwicklung und "Gesetze"* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie, XXXIV. 2).

ANCIENT HISTORY

Historical as well as classical students will be interested in the recent publication (Gustav Fock, Leipzig, 1910) of a *Catalogus Dissertationum Philologicarum Classicarum: Verzeichnis von etwa 27400 Abhandlungen aus dem Gesamtgebiete der Klassischen Philologie und Alterthumskunde*. Of the 654 pages 252 deal with dissertations on Latin authors, 154 with those on Greek, and 235 with *Alterthumswissenschaften* including history.

There is announced *Les Primitives Civilisations: Études sur la Préhistoire et l'Histoire jusqu'à la Fin de l'Empire Macédonien*, by Jacques de Morvan, formerly director-general of Egyptian antiquities (Paris, E. Leroux, 1910, pp. 600). This is apparently a work of generalization, beginning with "les temps géologiques".

Dr. Philippe Virey's *La Religion de l'Ancienne Égypte* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1910, pp. vii, 352) is a competent general survey made up of lectures given at the Institut Catholique de Paris.

The Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft reports as to recent progress in its excavations in Babylon and Assur in heft 43 of its *Mittheilungen*, and sums up the new light cast on history and institutions.

The new series, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit* (Leipzig, Hinrichs), has added a volume by H. Schneider, *Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden* (1910).

The publications of the year 1909 in the field of Greek and Roman history and archaeology form the subject of a comprehensive summary by Maurice Besnier in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for October.

The excavation of Cyrene undertaken by the Archaeological Institute of America, and placed under the charge of Mr. Richard Norton as director, was preceded in May and June by a preliminary reconnaissance, but began its permanent development in October.

Hans Delbrück under the title "Antike Kavallerie" publishes (*Klio*, X. 3) a defense of the views on this subject set forth in his *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* against the attacks made by Eduard Meyer in *Theopomp's Hellenika*. Professor Meyer's contention is that the ancient cavalry were of much less efficiency against good infantry than supposed by Professor Delbrück. On this difference of view as to the value and place of this arm of the ancient military forces depend quite different views as to the history of the most famous battles of antiquity.

The American Book Company announces *A Handbook of Greek Religion* by Arthur Fairbanks, director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (pp. 384). The author discriminates clearly between Greek religion and Greek mythology and says nothing of the latter. There is appended a brief critical notice of the existing literature in this field.

Loescher and Company, Rome, have published *Die Thermen des Agrippa: Ein Beitrag zur Topographie des Marsfeldes in Rom*, by Chr. Huelsen (1910, pp. 43). Plans and illustrations are profusely provided and the publication is distinguished by the fine workmanship of this house.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. M. Bolling, *Homeric Armor and Mr. Lang* (Catholic University Bulletin, October); P. Wendland, *Beiträge zur Athenischen Politik und Publicistik des Vierten Jahrhunderts*, I. *König Philippos und Isocrates* (Nachrichten von der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1910, 2); A. Janke, *Die Schlacht bei Issus* (*Klio*, X. 2); G. De Sanctis, *La Légende Historique des Premiers Siècles de Rome* (Journal des Savants, March-July); René Pichon, *Un Philosophe Ministre sous l'Empire Romain: Le Gouvernement de Sénèque* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); N. H. Baynes, *Rome and Armenia in the Fourth Century* (English Historical Review, October).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson's *St. Augustine and African Church Divisions* (London and New York, Longmans, 1910, pp. 154) gives in

a small, well-written book a learned, clear, and judicious account of the rise of the Donatists and of Augustine's conflicts, debates, and actions against them.

The Göttingen Academy has finished the printing of volume V. (Emilia) of Professor Kehr's *Italia Pontificia*, and of volume I. (Salzburg) of Professor Brackmann's *Germania Pontificia*, while the first volume of Dr. Wiederhold's *Gallia Pontificia* is well advanced; the three make great additions to the previously known stock of papal documents of the Middle Ages.

W. Konen has undertaken an exhaustive study of *Die Methoden der Germanenbekehrung*, and has published part I. as a Bonn dissertation under the title, *Die Heidenpredigt und der Germanenbekehrung* (Düsseldorf, W. Ohligschläger, 1910).

The Macmillan Company announces *The First Six Centuries of the History of the Church in Gaul*, by Canon Scott Holmes.

A. Hauck in *Die Entstehung der Geistlichen Territorien* (Abhandlungen der Leipziger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1909) deals particularly with the general causes of the establishment of ecclesiastical lands and with the composite lay-spiritual position of the bishops.

E. Leroux, Paris, announces *L'Église Arménienne, son Histoire, sa Doctrine, son Régime, sa Discipline, sa Liturgie, sa Littérature, son Présent*, by Malachia Ormanian, ci-devant Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Professor C. S. Terry has begun the publication with Routledge, London, of *The History of Europe in Relation to that of Great Britain* in two volumes. Volume I., just published, deals with the medieval period.

The Weidmannsche Buchhandlung of Berlin has just published part I. of Professor L. Schmidt's *Geschichte der Deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgange der Völkerwanderung*, this section being entitled *Die Geschichte der Ostgermanen*. It will be noted in this connection that a third revised edition by D. Coste of *Isidors Geschichte der Goten, Vandalen, Sueven, nebst Auszügen aus der Kirchengeschichte des Beda Venerabilis* was published in 1910 (Leipzig, Dyk) as Band X. of *Die Geschichtschreiber der Deutschen Vorzeit*.

Quelle and Meyer, Leipzig, announce *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, by R. M. Meyer.

Dr. Elias A. Loew has practically finished his work on the Beneventan Script. It will be published in a series of plates, one hundred in number, entitled *Scriptura Beneventana*, and a volume of text entitled *The Bene-*

ventan Script, both to be published by the Archaeological Institute of America.

In the *Romanische Forschungen*, XXVI., Jules Pirson has begun an important study under the title "Le Latin des Formules Mérovingiennes et Carolingiennes".

Father E. Tucek, S.J., in his *Untersuchungen über das Registrum super Negotio Romani Imperii* (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1910, pp. 77), studies a papal register of great importance for the first twelve years of Innocent III., devoted to the relations between the pope and the emperor.

The Heidelberg Academy of Sciences has undertaken the publication of the "Capuaner Briefsammlung" contained in Codex Latinus 11867 of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. The manuscript contains material of great interest for the period of Innocent III., and is known chiefly through the use already made of it by Professor K. Hampe, who will edit the projected edition.

A brief review of interest is Professor G. Schnurer's article in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* for September 10 entitled "Neuere Litteratur zur Geschichte des Tempelordens".

The biography of St. Francis of Assisi by the Danish Catholic littérateur Johannes Joergensen, a work not faultless in critical scholarship but of the greatest literary charm and insight, has been translated into French, German, Flemish, and Italian. The French version, by T. de Wyzewa, *Saint François d'Assise, sa Vie et son Oeuvre* (Paris, Perrin, 1909, pp. cii, 536), is we understand the most to be recommended, having important additions by author and translator.

Father Leonhard Lemmens's *Der hl. Bonaventura, Kardinal und Kirchenlehrer aus dem Franziskanerorden* (Kempten, Kösel, 1909, pp. viii, 288) is to be recommended as an authoritative monograph, based on the long labors which the author, president of the chief Franciscan institution of historical learning, the College of St. Bonaventura at Quaracchi, has expended in editing the works of the Seraphic Doctor.

M. Bretschneider, Rome, has published *Lettres de Benoît XII., 1334-1342: Textes et Analyses publiés par le Doct. Alphonse Fierens* (1910, pp. cxxii, 588).

The house of Th. Weicher, Leipzig, announces a third edition, enlarged (two volumes), of Professor Th. Nöldeke's *Geschichte des Qorans*. The revision is the work of Professor Friedrich Schwally.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Caspar, *Studien zum Regester Johannis VIII.* (Neues Archiv, LXIII. 1); P. Fedele, *Ricerche per la Storia di Roma e del Papato nel Secolo X.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXIII. 1-2); H. Rubat du Mérac, *L'Abbaye de Cluny* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); E. Göller, *Die Päpstlichen Reservationen und ihre Bedeutung für die Kirchliche Rechts-*

entwicklung des Ausgehenden Mittelalters (Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, XI. 12).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The interesting question of the relations of Luther and Erasmus has by an unusual chance been engaging recently the attention of three separate students who have published almost simultaneously. These publications are: André Meyer, *Étude Critique sur les Relations d'Érasme et de Luther* (Paris, Alcan, 1909, pp. xv, 194); Karl Zickendraht, *Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther über die Willensfreiheit dargestellt und beurtheilt* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1909, pp. xii, 205); H. Humbertclaude, *Érasme et Luther: Leur Polémique sur le Libre Arbitre* (Paris, Blond, 1910, pp. xxiii, 297).

John Murray announces *Sea Wolves of the Mediterranean: the Grand Period of the Moslem Corsairs*, by Commander E. Hamilton Currey, R. N., with illustrations.

M. Dorbon aîné, Paris, has just issued M. Loys Delteil's *Manuel de l'Amateur d'Estampes du XVIII^e Siècle*, an exhaustive history of eighteenth-century engraving, with descriptions of more than 1800 prints, short biographies of 795 artists, and much other information. All the continental countries of western Europe (as well as England) are represented, and there are 106 reproductions. A companion-work is issued by Messrs. Bell, London, *French Portrait Engraving of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, by T. H. Thomas.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Kalkoff, *Zur Luthers Römischem Prozess* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXI. 3); P. Richard, *Origines et Développement de la Secrétairerie d'État Apostolique, 1417-1823*, III. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, October); F. C. Roux, *La Russie et la Politique Italienne de Napoléon III.*, II. (Revue Historique, November-December).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The King has appointed a Royal Commission to inquire and report as to the working of all acts concerning public records in England and Wales, the rules and regulations now in force at the Public Record Office, the arrangements now in operation for the care and treatment of public records in England and Wales, the record publications of the United Kingdom issued since 1838, the custody of local records, the Record Office establishment, the training of archivists, etc. The commission will consist of Sir Frederick Pollock, chairman; Sir Evan Vincent Evans, Professor Charles H. Firth, Dr. Montague R. James, Mr. F. G. Kenyon, Mr. Sidney Lee, Mr. Henry Owen, Mr. H. R. Tedder, and Mr. W. Llewelyn Williams. Mr. Hubert Hall of the Public Record Office is appointed secretary.

Professor D. J. Medley of Glasgow publishes for students' use a well-selected volume of documents entitled *Original Illustrations of English Constitutional History* (London, Methuen, 1910, pp. xi, 397). It embraces several score of the most essential documents. Those in Old French are translated, as in Stubbs's volume; the reading of the Latin documents is helped ingeniously by marginal summaries.

The house of G. J. Göschen, Leipzig, has published *Die Englische Gerichtsverfassung* by Dr. Heinrich B. Gerland (two volumes, 1910).

The Oxford University Press announces *The Life of the Black Prince by the Herald of Sir John Chandos*, edited by M. K. Pope and E. C. Lodge; *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485-1714*, calendared by R. Steele under the direction of the Earl of Crawford (two volumes); *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*, by C. P. Lucas, part IV., *Newfoundland*, by J. D. Rogers; *The English Factories in India*, by W. Foster, volume V., 1634-1636; *Henry Fox, First Lord Holland*, by T. W. Riker (two volumes).

Dr. Charles Plummer's *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae partim hactenus ineditae* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1910, two volumes, pp. cxcii, 273, 391) contains thirty-two lives, chiefly from Dublin and Oxford manuscripts. A third of them are unpublished. All are edited with the learning and thoroughness characteristic of Dr. Plummer's editions of Bede and the *Chronicle*.

The Historical Association, Gray's Inn, London, publishes as Leaflet 22, September, 1910, *The Development of the Castle in England and Wales* (pp. 32, iv). The leaflet is accompanied by plans and a bibliographical note.

Elliot Stock, London, publishes *Domesday Book: the Cambridgeshire Portion of the Great Survey of England by William the Conqueror, A. D. MLXXXVI*. This is the first separate publication of this part of the survey and is printed both in the original and in a translation of the year 1867 by the Rev. William Bawdwen. The editor is the Rev. C. H. Evelyn-White, who supplies an introduction (pp. xxxviii, 174).

The Pipe Roll Society has published volume XXXI. (London, St. Catherine Press, 1910, pp. xxviii, 206), this being *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the 28th Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, 1181-1182*. The introduction is by Mr. Round.

Number XIV. of the Harvard Historical Studies is *The Frankpledge System*, by William Alfred Morris, professor of history in the University of Washington (Longmans, Green, and Company, 1910).

The Selden Society has just issued volume XXIV. of its publications, the fifth volume of its series of year-books, *The Eyre of Kent, 6 and 7 Edward II.*, edited by Messrs. Maitland, Harcourt, and Bolland.

The publication of John Leland's *Itinerary in and about the Years 1535-1543*, edited by Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith, is now completed by the addition of volume V., containing parts ix.-xi., with appendixes, glossary, and index, as well as various other sorts of aid to the student, including maps.

In September Longmans published Professor A. F. Pollard's *From the Accession of Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth*, the concluding volume of the *Political History of England*.

Dr. Rudolf Jung's *Die Englische Flüchtlingsgemeinde in Frankfurt-am-Main, 1554-1559* (Frankfurt, Baer, 1910, pp. 66), is an alphabetical list of names, with biographical data, useful to students of the history of Calvinism.

Constable, London, has just issued *A History of English Dramatic Companies, 1556-1643*, by J. Tucker Murray (two volumes).

The Oxford University Press has published recently *The French Renaissance in England: an Account of the Literary Relations of England and France in the Sixteenth Century*, by Sidney Lee.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Company publish *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, by Dr. Roland G. Usher of Washington University, St. Louis. The work is concerned especially with the policy of Archbishop Richard Bancroft.

Anyone who wishes a very brief but clear and competent survey of the history of Puritanism in England may be recommended to read Dr. John Brown's *The English Puritans* (Cambridge, University Press, 1910, pp. 160).

The following recent publication will doubtless be a welcome addition to the scanty material in this field: F. K. and S. Hitching, *References to English Surnames in 1601: an Index giving about 19,650 References to Surnames contained in the Printed Registers of 778 English Parishes during the First Year of the Seventeenth Century* (Walton-on-Thames, Charles A. Bernan, 1910, pp. lxx).

The Cambridge University Press has begun the publication of a series of *Girton College Studies* with a volume by Miss Theodora Keith on *Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707*. Two other volumes are announced for immediate publication.

Dr. William Robert Scott, lecturer in political economy in the University of St. Andrews, has brought out, through the Cambridge University Press, the second volume, shortly to be followed by the first, of a work entitled *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720*. The first volume will record the general development of the joint-stock system in Great Britain and Ireland up to 1720, with due consideration of the chief social, political, industrial, and commercial tendencies which influenced it. The second

volume treats specifically of the companies formed for foreign trade, colonization, fishing, and mining.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers publish in America *Lord Chatham: his Early Life and Connections*, by Lord Rosebery.

John Murray, London, announces *Industrial England in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century*, by Sir Henry Trueman Wood.

The War in Wexford: an Account of the Rebellion in the South of Ireland in 1798, by Messrs. H. F. B. Wheeler and A. M. Broadley (London and New York, John Lane, 1910, pp. xvi, 343), is based especially upon the papers of the Earl of Mount Norris, but includes also the full text of the journal of Mrs. Brownrigg of Greenmound.

Stephens and Hunt's *History of the Church* has just been completed by the publication, as volume VIII., of *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, by F. W. Cornish, vice-provost of Eton College.

John Murray announces volume I. of the *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, by W. F. Monypenny, to cover the period 1804-1837: the work will be completed in four or five volumes. Lord Rowton, who was designated by Lord Beaconsfield as his biographer, died before proceeding beyond the arrangement of the material, and the trustees of the estate after considerable delay fixed upon the present editor. He has depended largely upon Disraeli's letters (many of which have already been published), and has made considerable use of the biographical indications in the novels. The volume has been reviewed by Lord Morley in a recent issue of the *Times*.

The Macmillan Company has just published *The Reminiscences of Goldwin Smith*, edited by Arnold Haultain, the deceased writer's secretary and literary executor.

It is announced that Mr. George Macaulay Trevelyan is engaged in writing the life of John Bright.

The Right Honorable Cecil John Rhodes: a Monograph and a Reminiscence, by Sir Thomas Fuller, agent-general for the Cape of Good Hope and one of the trustees of the Rhodes bequests, is published by Longmans, Green, and Company (1910). The work results from close intimacy with Mr. Rhodes from 1881 to his death, and is apparently devoted to this period.

The British Empire: its Past, its Present, and its Future (London, The League of the Empire, 1909, pp. xxxii, 864), written by various high authorities and edited by Mr. A. F. Pollard, is an important attempt to summarize in one volume the history and resources of the various parts of the British Empire.

Students of recent British and colonial history will welcome such a valuable compilation as *The Legislation of the Empire, being a Survey*

of the *Legislative Enactments of the British Dominions from 1898 to 1907* (London, Butterworth, 1909, four volumes), edited under the direction of the Society of Comparative Legislation by C. E. A. Bedwell.

Longmans, Green, and Company announce *A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest*, by John Edward Lloyd, professor in the University College of North Wales.

Number VII. of the *St. Andrews University Publications* is *The Statutes of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Theology at the Period of the Reformation*. It is edited with introduction and notes by Robert Kerr Hannay (St. Andrews, W. C. Henderson and Son, 1910). The introduction occupies pages 1-86 and the statutes (in the original Latin), pages 87-135.

Messrs. Maclehose and Sons announce a new volume of William Law Mathieson's *History of Scotland* under the title *The Awakening of Scotland*, dealing with the period 1747-1797.

The Madras Government Press has issued (1908-1910) *Selections from the Records of the Madras Government: Dutch Records*, nos. 1-10. The Dutch documents which this series is intended to publish cover the period 1664-1825 and an English catalogue of them was issued a few years ago. The total number of documents is 1632, only the more important of which will be published; those in this volume are concerned wholly with the eighteenth century.

Documentary publications: *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, Henry III., 1258-1266; *House of Lords Manuscripts*, vol. V., 1702-1704; *Historical Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, vol. II., pt. iv.; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series*, III.; *Papers of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., of Dropmore*, VII., 1804-1805 [Historical Manuscripts Commission].

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Riess, *Zur Vorgeschichte der Magna Charta* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XIII. 4); W. Busch, *Englands Kriege im Jahre 1513, Guinegate, Flodden* (ibid., XIII. 3. 4); J. H. Clapham, *The Last Years of the Navigation Acts* (English Historical Review, October).

FRANCE

The *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France* has had added to it recently a volume on the library of the Senate, one embracing several smaller Paris libraries, an index to the volumes dealing with Rheims, and a catalogue of the Prosper Tarbé collection at Rheims.

The liberality of M. Jacques Doucet, known for his private collections, has recently made possible the beginning of a series of *Publications pour Faciliter les Études d'Art en France*, and there has appeared under this head the first issue of a *Répertoire d'Art et d'Archéologie*, to

be published quarterly with the object of giving a complete review of French and foreign journals of art and archaeology.

In 1860 M. Hippolyte Cocheris published a general index to the *Journal des Savants*, but no such aid has been in existence for the later period. When this journal recently ceased to be the organ of the entire Institute and was placed under the control of the Academy of Inscriptions M. Jean Tissier was entrusted with the task of making good this deficiency, and his *Table Analytique des Articles du Journal des Savants* was issued by Hachette in 1909. The new index is much less elaborate than the old, however. Another useful piece of work of this kind is the recent index of the *Mercure de France* for the period 1672-1832, prepared by M. Étienne Deville, with special reference to entries in the field of art.

The new *Revue d'Histoire des Doctrines Économiques et Sociales* (founded in 1908) has recently undertaken the additional publication of a *Bulletin Bibliographique d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, limited to French material and edited by MM. Roger Picard and Marc Barry.

An interesting volume of varied contents is *Mélanges Offerts à M. Émile Chatelain par ses Élèves et ses Amis* (Paris, 1910). The contributions are mainly in the field of Carolingian palaeography and are accompanied by unusually good facsimiles.

Fascicle 27 of the *Recueil de Travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie* of the University of Louvain is entitled *La Juridiction Ecclésiastique en Matière Bénéficiale sous l'Ancien Régime en France*, I., *La Juridiction Contentieuse* (Brussels, Albert Dewit, 1910, pp. xxxi, 217). It is the work of Pierre Delannoy. The author deals with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction as falling into *volontaire* and *contentieuse*, and the present volume takes up the cases of the latter category occurring in connection with the *appels comme d'abus* and *la règle du dévolut*. The treatise is prepared with the supervision of Professor A. Cauchie and is submitted apparently as a doctoral dissertation.

In the *Collection des Textes sur l'Histoire des Institutions et des Services Publiques de la France Moderne et Contemporaine* edited by Professor Camille Bloch and published by Edouard Cornély, Paris, there has just been published *Les Impôts Directs sous l'Ancien Régime et Principalement au XVIII^e Siècle*, by Professor Marcel Marion. There will appear soon in the same series the following works: *Le Gouvernement Révolutionnaire*, by P. Mautouchet; *Le Recrutement de l'Armée pendant la Révolution et l'Empire*, by P. Caron; *Le Crédit au XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles*, by Germain Martin.

Hachette, Paris, has issued complete part I. of tome IX. of the *Lavissee Histoire de France*, dealing with *Le Règne de Louis XVI., 1774-1789*; it is the work of H. Carré, P. Sagnac, and E. Lavissee. The second

part of tome IX. will be a *Table Analytique* and is announced for the beginning of 1911.

Professor Fred M. Fling expects to have the second volume of his *Mirabeau and the French Revolution* ready for the press next summer.

On the repeated recommendation of the Commission on the Economic History of the Revolution the French government has established (June, 1910) an additional "Commission des Recherches sur l'Histoire Économique des Territoires qui ont fait autrefois Partie de la France", consisting of eleven members under the presidency of M. Armand Brette. This commission is now engaged in a preliminary consideration of the scope and methods of work. One of the latest issues of the main commission is *Cahiers de Doléances pour les États Généraux de 1789 (Marne)*, *Bailliages de Sézanne et Chatillon-sur-Marne Réunis*, pt. 1. *Sézanne*. This is edited by Gustave Laurent (Épernay, 1909) and bears strong testimony to the care and completeness with which this material is being laid before us. The *cahiers* are accompanied by such analyses of related documents and by such information as to the physical conditions of the parishes as is required for full comprehension. The second part, for Chatillon-sur-Marne, will appear shortly. M. Roger Picard's *Les Cahiers de 1789 et les Classes Ouvrières* (Paris, Marcel Rivière, 1910, pp. 276) is an important work in this field.

A useful summary is contained in the volume by G. Aron published by Larose and Tenin (Paris, 1910, pp. 98) under the title *Les Grandes Réformes du Droit Révolutionnaire*, being a course of lectures given in the University of Brussels in 1908.

The *Mémoires* of General Decaen, of which the manuscript has been deposited since 1876 in the municipal library of Caen and which has been used there by various writers, is now being edited for publication by Colonel Picard and Lieutenant V. Paulier, volume I. being already published (Plon, Paris, 1910). This volume covers the period 1792—an VIII.

After an interval of sixteen years the French government has resumed the publication of the *Papiers de Barthélemy, Ambassadeur de France en Suisse*, by the issue of volume VI., containing nearly two hundred documents on the negotiations for the treaties of Basel, nearly seventy on the exchange of the Princess Marie Thérèse, and a general index.

The Conseil Général of the Seine has begun a series entitled *Histoire des Communes Annexées à Paris en 1859*; the first issue is an imposing volume on Bercy by Lucien Lambeau (E. Leroux, 1910). M. Lambeau is secretary "de la commission du Vieux-Paris". In this volume he has endeavored to establish the topography of the ancient Bercy and bring together the documentary material for the domains which formerly constituted it. These documents are appended with

explanatory notes. Plans and photogravures add much to the value of a volume having the greatest interest to all who are interested in the archaeology of Paris. A preface explains the origins and plans of the commission entrusted with the work of which this is one of the first-fruits. There remain ten other communes to be dealt with under this head, and if the work continues to be done on this scale the enterprise will become one of magnitude; taking it in connection with the new *Bibliothèque d'Histoire de Paris* a large amount of trustworthy monographic work will soon be at the disposal of the student.

M. Rod. Reuss of the National Archives has for some time been engaged in a thorough study of Alsatian archives with a view to adding to his *Alsace au XVIII^e Siècle* a history of the Revolution in Alsace. Meanwhile he has issued a part of his material in a recently published volume, *Notes sur l'Instruction Primaire en Alsace pendant la Révolution* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1910, pp. 332). He has also published recently in the *Revue des Études Juives* a study entitled "Quelques Documents Nouveaux sur l'Antisémitisme dans le Bas-Rhin de 1794 à 1799".

Documentary publications: *Lettres de Louis XI.*, volume XI. (and last); R. Delachenal, *Chronique des Règnes de Jean II. et de Charles V.*, I., 1350-1364 (Publications de la Société de l'Histoire de France, Laurens, pp. 352); E. Deprez, *Oeuvres Complètes de Maximilien Robespierre*, pt. I. (Société des Études Robespierriennes, Paris, Leroux); A. Fribourg, *Discours de Danton* (Hachette, pp. xxxviii, 274); A. de Boislisle, L. Lecestre, and J. de Boislisle, *Mémoires de Saint-Simon*, XXII. (Hachette, pp. 557); C. Stryenski, *Mesdames de France, Filles de Louis XV.*; *Documents Inédits* (Paris, Émile-Paul, pp. viii, 354); L. Delavaud, *Documents Inédits sur le Duc de Saint-Simon, 1694-1746* (La Rochelle, 1910).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Busquet, *Les Cadastres et les Unités Cadastres en Provence du XV^e au XVIII^e Siècle* (Annales de Provence, 1910); E. Griselle, *Louis XIII. et sa Mère*, I. (Revue Historique, November-December); H. Cavaillès, *Une Fédération Pyrénéenne sous l'Ancien Régime* (*ibid.*, September-October, November-December); E. Levasseur, *Les Grandes Campagnes de Commerce sous le Règne de Louis XIV.* (Annales des Sciences Politiques, July 15); Albert Sorel, *Deux Conceptions de l'Histoire de la Révolution: Taine et M. Aulard* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); Ph. Sagnac, *Les Origines de la Révolution: La Décomposition de l'Ancien Régime* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, July-August); A. Aulard, *Napoléon et l'Instruction Publique: La Loi du 11 Floréal an X et son Application* (La Révolution Française, September-October); P. Muret, *Émile Ollivier et le Duc de Grammont des 12 et 13 juillet 1870*, concl. (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, July-August).

ITALY AND SPAIN

All searchers in Italian archives will be grateful to the Ministry of the Interior for the issue of the manual, *Ordinamento delle Carte degli Archivi di Stato Italiani: Manuale Storico Archivistico* (Rome, 1910, Tipografia Mantellate, pp. xiv, 312), in which a conspectus is given of all the divisions and subdivisions of all the nineteen Italian state archives, with accounts of their history and organization, and bibliographies of their catalogues and of articles descriptive of them.

The fifth volume of *Gli Archivi della Storia d'Italia*, published under the direction of G. Degli Azzi (succeeding to G. Mazzatinti), deals with a number of municipal collections investigated by different scholars. Volume VI. is devoted to the state archives of Reggio and is the work of U. Dallari. It may be noted in this connection that a considerable addition to the Roman archives or rather perhaps a considerable increase in the facility with which they may be used seems likely to follow from a recent order for the concentration in the palace of the Lateran of the archives of the Roman parishes.

An interesting situation seems to exist in regard to the proposed establishment at the University of Rome of a chair in the philosophy of history. May 20 the Minister of Public Instruction introduced into the Chamber a measure to this effect and its acceptance by the Chamber seems probable; the Faculty of Letters of the University, however, has voted against the proposal (May 26), though it is not clear whether this is through hostility to the idea or through hostility to the expected selection of Guglielmo Ferrero for the new chair.

An important contribution to the history of the papal archives is the study by F. Ehrle in the *Mélanges Chatelain* (Paris, 1910) under the title "Die Frangipani und der Untergang des Archivs und der Bibliothek der Päpste am Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts". He disputes the previous suppositions as to the nature and place of this destruction and concludes that it occurred at the palace of the Lateran and was due to fire and later neglect and plundering.

Professor Joseph Schnitzer of the University of Munich, after a delay of some years through personal difficulties with the papacy as a "modernist", has resumed the publication of *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Savonarolas* with a volume entitled *Savonarola nach den Aufzeichnungen des Florentiners Piero Parenti* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, 1910, pp. clxii, 322). Piero Parenti was one of the judges who condemned Savonarola; he left a large body of manuscript on the events of his time, and from this, on the whole not unfavorable to Savonarola, Professor Schnitzer has made selections.

L. Pierro, Naples, has published (1910, pp. 473) volume III. of Fr. Carrano's *L'Italia dal 1789 al 1870: Opera Inedita Pubblicata a Cura del Generale E. Carrano*. The volume covers 1820-1847.

M. Georges Bourgin continues and completes in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for August, 1910, his bibliographical summary of the Risorgimento, dealing with the works devoted to the period 1846-1871.

Two important studies have been recently published upon King Charles Albert and his sons Victor Emanuel II. and Ferdinand, duke of Genoa, which exhibit a gratifying sincerity in the historical treatment of these progenitors and great grand-uncle of the reigning king of Italy. One, relating to *Le Idee Politiche del Re Carlo Alberto*, has been published by L. C. Bollea in the *Rivista d'Italia* for October; it denies frankly the revolutionary liberalism of Charles Albert, although maintaining that he showed sincere love for Italy as an enlightened conservative and reformer. The other, relating to *L'Educazione d'un Principe, Ferdinando di Savoia Duca di Genova*, has been published by G. U. Oxilia in the *Nuova Antologia* for November 1; it is based upon the papers of Father Lorenzo Isuardi, preceptor of the two sons of Charles Albert, and throws much new light upon the boyhood of Victor Emanuel II. as well as upon that of his brother Ferdinand; many letters of the princes and other documents are given.

The tenth of August, 1910, was the centenary of the birth of Cavour and the day was observed in Italy as a national holiday. Much publication has naturally occurred recently on the subject of Cavour, accelerated through the coincidence of the falling of this centenary along with the semi-centennial of the movements of 1860. A review of part of the new publications will be found in the *Archivio Storico Italiano* for October, by Ersilio Michel, under the title "Nel Cinquantenario della Rivoluzione Toscana".

Domenico Carutti, who died on August 4, 1909, was one of the last survivors of the old school of Piedmontese patriots, the collaborators of Cavour in the making of Italy, most of whom were at once statesmen, students, and *galantuomini*. Two commemorative studies of his life and works have now been published: Piero De Donato-Giannini's *Domenico Carutti, 1821-1909* (Napoli, F. Casella, 1910), and Laderchi's *Sulla Vita e sulle Opere di Domenico Carutti*, an essay prepared with better historical method, published in the *Rivista d'Italia* for October.

Fratelli Treves, Milan, announce the publication of *I Mille: Memorie Postume*, by Francesco Crispi, edited by his daughter. This is one of the most interesting items in a large number of publications and announcements of this sort representing an activity called forth by the semi-centennial of the Risorgimento events of 1860. A great deal of this activity is displayed by municipal administrations, the Palermo municipal committee for the celebration, *c. g.*, publishing *Documenti e Memorie della Rivoluzione Siciliana del 27 Maggio 1860*.

The municipality of Venice has renewed its offer of a prize of £8000 for the best *Storia Documentata della Rivoluzione e della Difesa di*

Venezia negli Anni 1848-1849. The competition is open to all Italian writers and the manuscripts must be deposited by May 31, 1911.

The *States of Italy* series (Methuen, London), edited by Edward Armstrong and Langton Douglas, has added *A History of Verona*, by A. M. Allen, illustrated and accompanied by maps and bibliography (1910, pp. 403).

Fernández de Bethencourt's *Historia Genealógica y Heráldica de la Monarquía Española, Casa Real y Grandes de España* has reached the eighth volume (Madrid, Fernando Fé).

Don Juan Pérez de Guzmán y Gallo has supplied an introduction for the second edition of Antonio Cánovas del Castillo's *Historia de la Decadencia de España desde el Advenimiento de Felipe III. al Trono hasta la Muerte de Carlos II.* (Madrid, Fernando Fé, 1910).

M. Pierre Conard, whose *Napoléon et Catalogne* is reviewed on a preceding page, has published under the title *La Constitution de Bayonne (1808): Essai d'Édition Critique* (Paris, Cornély, 1910, pp. 183) a conspectus of the Spanish and French texts of the constitution in question and of four preliminary drafts drawn up in May and June, 1808. The texts are preceded by an introduction thoroughly describing the process of formation of the document and the events leading up to it.

The John Lane Company has published (September, 1910) *A Queen at Bay: the Story of Maria Cristina and Don Carlos*, by Edmund B. d'Auvergne.

Fernando Fé, Madrid, has published *Un Revolucionario de Accion: Francisco Ferrer, su Vida, su Obra Destructiva, Justicia de su Condena*, by Casimiro Comas (1910).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

The *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, heft 3, "Nachrichten und Notizen", II., contains not only a full statement of the conditions of publication for the *Monumenta Germanica Historica* during the year preceding the annual meeting in April of the Zentralkommission, but also gives detailed information of the issues soon to go to press and of the new undertakings of the commission. Similar information will be found in the *Neues Archiv*, LXIII. 1. An article by A. Werminghoff on the history and work of the commission is published in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*, XXV. 7. An interesting note as to Stein's relations to the work is reprinted in the above-mentioned issue of the *Neues Archiv* from a recent contribution to the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Heidelberg Academy of Science. No. 4 of the *Vierteljahrschrift* contains reports from several of the other German historical commissions.

The plenary meeting of the Historical Commission connected with the Bavarian Academy was held May 18-20 under the presidency of

Professor Moritz Ritter. The following new publications were reported: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Band 55, *Schluss*; *Quellen und Erörterungen zur Bayerischen und Deutschen Geschichte, N. F., Chroniken*, Band II., pt. 2; *Historische Volkslieder und Zeitgedichte vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, Band II. The following were announced as in the press: *Geschichte der Deutschen Rechtswissenschaft* (Professor Landsberg), Band III., pt. 2; *Deutsche Städtechroniken: Lübecker Chroniken*, Band IV. (Dr. Bruns); *Quellen und Erörterungen, Chroniken, Die Werke Veit Arnpecks*; *Reichstagsakten, Ältere Reihe*, Band XIII., pt. 2, Albrecht II. (Professor Beckmann).

The *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte* will be known in future as the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts*. The society has during the past three years issued ten volumes of the *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, besides separate publications, and plans to increase its activity in the field of general German educational history.

A work representing much labor and of unusual interest is *Das Deutsche Studententum von den Ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Voigtländer, 1910), by Fr. Schulze and Paul Ssymank. It is one of the works published in celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Berlin; part I., dealing with the period 1350-1750, is by Dr. Schulze, part II., by Dr. Ssymank.

Boniface of Crediton and his Companions (London, 1910, pp. 372) is an unpretending but scholarly course of lectures delivered some years ago in Bristol Cathedral by the Bishop of Bristol, Right Rev. Dr. G. F. Browne.

Kulturgeschichte der Deutschen im Mittelalter, by Dr. George Steinhäusen (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, pp. 181), a volume in the series *Wissenschaft und Bildung*, is a model of broad, concise treatment of a large subject by an eminent expert.

The house of Carl Kuhn, Munich, has begun the publication of *Deutsche Schrifttafeln des 9. bis 16. Jahrhunderts aus Handschriften der Kgl. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*, edited by Erich Petzet and Otto Gaunung. Abtheilung I is *Althochdeutsche Schriftdenkmäler des 9. bis 11. Jahrhundert*. The work will be in five Abtheilungen, each comprising fifteen or sixteen photographic plates, and will be completed in 1912.

The second volume of O. Posse's *Die Siegel der Deutschen Kaiser und Könige* has appeared (Dresden, 1910), and is likely to add largely to our knowledge in this field for the period 1347-1493. A special feature is the insertion of twenty-four plates of false seals representing the whole medieval period. A new contribution to the equipment in this work is a small volume by E. Hauviller, *Die Erhaltung der Siegel, ihre Bedeutung für die Historischen Hilfswissenschaften, ihr Kunst- und Kulturgeschichtlichen Wert* (Metz, 1910).

An acute investigation of the matter by F. Frensdorff in *Hansische Geschichtsblätter* for 1910 under the title "Reich und Reichstag" produces the conclusion that the term *Reichstag* does not appear before the end of the fifteenth century, the earlier names in use being *Hof*, *Sprache*, *Tag*, *Versammlung*.

Some of the German historical commissions are in the habit of issuing as *Neujahrsblätter* volumes for the general public, and the Royal Saxon Historical Commission has published in this form a volume by R. Köttschke, *Staat und Kultur im Zeitalter der Ostdeutschen Kolonisation* (Leipzig, Joh. Warner, 1910).

The much vexed question of responsibility for the destruction of Magdeburg in the Thirty Years' War is raised anew by R. Jordan in the *Jahresbericht des Thüringisch-Sächsischen Vereins* (1909-1910) with the publication of some new material tending to fix this responsibility on the Imperialists.

Hermann Hallwich, who in 1879 published a two-volume work entitled *Wallenstein's Ende* and who since that time has discovered much new Wallenstein material, publishes with Duncker and Humblot, Leipzig, *Fünf Bücher Geschichte Wallensteins*, three volumes (1910). The study comes to 1630.

Parey of Berlin has published part 1. of Band V. of Schmoller and Stolze's *Die Behördenorganisation und die Allgemeine Staatsverwaltung Preussens im 18. Jahrhundert*; Band III. of Schmoller, Naudé, and Skalweit's *Die Getreidchandelspolitik und Kriegsmagazinverwaltung Preussens* (dealing with 1740-1756); and Band III. of Schmoller and von Schrötter's *Das Preussische Münzwesen im 18. Jahrhundert* (1755-1765). These volumes appear in the *Acta Borussica*.

The approaching centenary of the War of Liberation has stimulated publication, and the house of Georg Wiegand, Leipzig, has undertaken a new series of "Memoirs and Letters of the Napoleonic Epoch" under the editorship of Theodor Rehtwisch. The opening volume is from the notes of a Saxon officer of the staff, Otto von Odeleben, and bears the title *Mit Napoleon im Felde, 1813*. The series bears the designation, *Aus Vergelbten Pergamenten*.

Heft 21 of the *Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neuere Geschichte* is *Die Demokratische Bewegung in Berlin im Oktober 1848*, by Gustaf Luders (Berlin, 1909).

Professor Dr. Adalbert Wahl and the publishing house of J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, announce the issue of "eine Sammlung Monographien zur Parteigeschichte", as *Vorarbeiten* rather than as definitive scientific works. While German parties are primarily in mind, studies in French and English party history will be included, and special attention will be given to the mutual relations of political parties in different countries, as also to the social and economic affiliations of individual parties. The

series will begin with a volume by Dr. L. Bergstrasser, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Zentrumsparlei*, one by Dr. A. Rapp on *Friedrich Theodor Vischer und die Politik*, and one by Dr. W. Reinohl, *Uhland als Politiker*.

The annual report of the *Hansische Geschichtsverein* shows the following publication conditions: B. Hagedorn has undertaken the investigation of German-Spanish relations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the report of Hapke on the "Niederländische Inventarien" has been published; Band VIII., Abth. 3, of the *Hanscrezesse*, edited by Dr. Schäfer, is partly printed; Simson's *Danziger Inventar* will be published in the autumn of 1910; Band IV. of the *Abhandlungen zur Verkehrs- und Seegeschichte*, A. Puschel's *Das Wachstum der Deutschen Städte in der Mittelalterlichen Kolonialzeit*, and a volume on Wismar by Techen, have been published; the prize offered for a history "der Deutschen Seeschiffahrt" has been partially awarded to W. Vogel, who is to complete his work in three years.

Heft XIX. of the *Leipziger Historische Abhandlungen* is *Der Bürgerstand in Strassburg bis zur Mitte des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1910, pp. 55) by Dr. Karl Achtnich.

In the second volume of the *Chroniken der Stadt Bamberg* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1910, pp. xcii, 717), edited by Dr. Anton Chroust, the Gesellschaft für Fränkische Geschichte brings out an important body of material on the history of the Peasants' Revolt of 1525, and another on the struggle of Bamberg in 1553 against the Margrave Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg. In the former section appear a nearly contemporary account of the episode by Councillor Marx Halbritter, another by Martin Müllner, secretary to the bishop, a brief diary of the outbreak, by a citizen, three letters from inmates of the convent of Clares, and two historical poems. For the second episode we are presented with a narrative of the utmost importance, the diary of Burgomaster Hans Zeitlos, and with another by a sister in the convent of the Clares. The editor supplies an admirable introduction and many notes.

No. 13-14 of the *Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte* is a careful monograph by Dr. P. Wappler on *Die Stellung Kursachsens und des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen zur Täuferbewegung* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1910, pp. xii, 254), of which the latter half consists of documents hitherto unpublished.

The Society for the History of Lorraine publishes, through Quelle and Meyer of Leipzig, a treatise in monetary history by Dr. Alfred Weyhmann, *Die Merkantilistische Währungspolitik Herzog Leopolds von Lothringen, 1697-1729* (pp. 100), having special reference to the *leopold d'or* and to the career of John Law.

The report of the Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Oesterreichs for 1909 informs us as to the annual assembly in October, 1909, and as to

progress in the work under way. The second volume of Ludwig Bittner's *Chronologische Verzeichnis der Österr. Staatsverträge*, dealing with the period 1763-1847, has been published (Wien, Holzhausen, 1909). The publication of the text of treaties has been or will soon be added to by the second volume of the Treaties with England (to 1791, by Professor Pribram); the first volume of the Treaties with Holland (to 1724, H. von Srbik), and the Treaties with Transylvania. L. Bittner has undertaken the preliminary work for the *Kollektivvorträge* since 1813. W. Bauer will soon publish the general introduction to the *Korrespondenz* of Ferdinand I., V. Bihl is occupied with that of Maximilian II., and H. Kretschmayr will publish soon the second part of the *Geschichte der Oesterreichischen Zentralverwaltung*.

The *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* (XXXIII. 3, pp. 506-520) contains a careful review by M. Vancsa of "Die Historische Litteratur Nieder- und Oberösterreichs in den Jahren 1905-1908". It is devoted almost wholly to periodical publications in the German language.

Franz Martin Mayer's *Geschichte Oesterreichs mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Kulturleben* has been regarded by many from its first appearance in 1875 as the best work of its scope in this field, and the second edition which was issued in 1909 will therefore be very welcome. The book is in two volumes and the narrative is brought to 1908.

Some important contributions to Austro-Hungarian constitutional history have recently appeared in the *Österreichische Rundschau*. In numbers 21, 22, Johann Ankiewicz discusses *Die Grundlinien der Inneren Entwicklung Österreichs* since the middle of the eighteenth century, and in number 23 H. Steinacker investigates the character of the union between Austria and Hungary, in opposition especially to the recent contention of Count Apponyi that this union is only an alliance which either can modify or withdraw from at will.

We have a new contribution to the correspondence of Gentz in *Briefe von und an Friedrich von Gentz*, published under the auspices of the Wedekind-Stiftung and edited by Fr. Carl Wittichen, Band I., II. (R. Oldenbourg, 1909, 1910). It is not intended to gather here the whole correspondence but simply to complete the collections already published by four volumes embracing scattered and varied material. The regrettable fact that Fr. Karl Wittichen, who succeeded to the editorship on the death of his brother, Paul Wittichen, has also passed away with the task unfinished may retard the completion of the undertaking, though the material is announced as nearly ready.

An important addition to Metternichian material is the *Lettres du Prince de Metternich à la Comtesse de Lieven, 1818-1819*, edited by J. Hanoteau and published by Plon-Nourrit (Paris, 1909). Taking this in connection with E. Daudet's recent researches as to the Comtesse

(later Princess) de Lieven we have now full information about a personal influence of considerable importance in Metternich's career.

The Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart, has published (1910), Band I. of *Graf Julius Andrassy: Sein Leben und seine Zeit, nach Neuen Quellen*, by Eduard von Wertheimer. This first volume extends to Andrassy's appointment as minister of foreign affairs.

An interesting brief recapitulation is that contained in Dr. August Fournier's *Wie wir zu Bosnien kamen* (Wien, Reisser's Söhne, 1909, pp. 96). The writer contends that Austria in the final occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was only proceeding to a step consented to by Europe in and since the treaty of Berlin, and that she did so finally because of apprehension at the progress of Neoslavism.

September 5-6 there occurred in Lausanne at the restored castle of Chillon a joint meeting of three Swiss historical associations—the Société Général de l'Histoire, the Société des Monuments Historiques, and the Société d'Histoire de la Suisse Romande. The first-named association is now in its seventy-first year and has in co-operation with the Association Populaire Catholique de la Suisse undertaken the publication of a new series of the *Acta Pontificum Helvetica*, beginning with 1305.

An important new undertaking is a *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte* by Emil Egli, of which Band I., 1519-1525, has been published (Zurich, Zürcher and Furrer, 1910, pp. xvi, 424). It is published under the patronage of the Zwingli Society of Zurich and will embrace a number of volumes. Professor Egli's death necessitated the completion of volume I. by Professor Georg Finsler, and will probably cause considerable delay in the prosecution of the work.

Plon, Paris, has issued (1910) *Napoléon et la Suisse, 1803-1815, d'après les Documents Inédits des Affaires Étrangères*, by Édouard Guillon.

Documentary publications: K. Rümmler, *Die Akten der Gesandtschaften Ludwigs des Baiern an Benedikt XII. und Klemens VI.* [Quellenstudien aus dem Historischen Seminar der Universität] (Innsbruck, Wagner); *Die Chroniken der Deutschen Städte vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert*, Band XXX. Lübeck (Leipzig, H. Hirzel); *Abhandlungen zur Landeskunde der Provinz Westpreussens*, heft XIV., *Die Denkmalpflege in Westpreussen, 1804-1810* (Danzig, A. W. Kafemann); *Die Böhmisches Landtagsverhandlungen und Landtagsbeschlüsse vom J. 1526 an bis auf die Neuzeit* [K. Böhmisches Landesarchiv], XI., *Die Landtage des J. 1605*, pt. 1. (Prag, 1910); *Mitteilungen der Kgl. Preussischen Archivverwaltung*, heft XVI., *Die Königs- und Kaiserurkunden der Königlichen Preussischen Staatsarchive und des Königl. Hausarchivs bis 1439* (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1910, pp. x, 184).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Keutgen, *Die Entstehung der Deutschen Ministerialität*, concl. (Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, VIII. 4); A. Kiesselbach, *Zur Frage der Entstehung der Städtehanse* (Historische Zeitschrift, CV. 3); H. Keussen, *Die Entwicklung der Älteren Kölner Verfassung und ihre Topographische Grundlage* (Westdeutsche Zeitschrift, XXVIII. 4); Kuno Francke, *Die Mystik des Mittelalters in ihrer Bedeutung für die Deutsche Kulturgeschichte* (Internationale Wochenschrift, September 10); A. C. McGiffert, *Martin Luther and his Work*, I. (Century, December); G. Sommerfeldt, *Die Beratungen über eine gegen Russland und die Türkei zu Gewährende Reichshilfe, 1560-1561* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XIII. 2); J. Strieder, *Maria Theresia, Kaunitz, und die Oesterreichische Politik von 1748-1755* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XIII. 4); F. K. Wittichen, *Zur Geschichte der Öffentlichen Meinung in Preussen vor 1806* (Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte, XXIII. 1); A. Fournier, *Friedrich Gentz und der Friede von Schönbrunn: Neue Briefe* (Deutsche Rundschau, August); E. Müsebeck, *Die Einleitung des Verfahrens gegen E. M. Arndt* (Historische Zeitschrift, CV. 3); O. Diether, *Leopold v. Ranke und Johann Gustaf Droysen* (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); G. Goyau, *Bismarck et l'Épiscopat* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 1); M. Lair, *Mommsen, Homme Politique* (Annales des Sciences Politiques, September 15); R. F. Kajndl, *Studien zur Geschichte des Deutschen Rechtes in Ungarn und dessen Nebenländern* (Archiv für Oesterreichischen Geschichte, XCVIII. 2).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Martinus Nijhoff of the Hague announces the preparation of a new Dutch biographical dictionary, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, in twelve volumes, edited by Professor P. J. Blok and Dr. P. C. Molhuysen. Each volume will have a separate alphabetical arrangement and will be published when sufficient material for one volume is ready. The first volume will appear shortly, the last in ten or twelve years.

Mr. Nijhoff also announces the publication of *De Teruggave der Oost-Indische Koloniën, 1814-1816*, from original materials, by P. H. van der Kemp (1910, pp. vi, 545).

The Belgian archive administration has begun the publication of a special series of inventories devoted to the minor archives of the kingdom, such as belong to religious establishments, small towns, and the like, by the issue of the first volume of *Inventaires Sommaires des Petites Archives du Hainaut* (Mons, Duquesne, 1910, pp. 88), a volume abounding especially in notices of archives of abbeys.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Johnen, *Philipp von Elsass, Graf von Flandern, 1157-1191* (Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire, LXXIX. 3); *Philip van Artevelde* (Edinburgh Review, October).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Norwegian government has lately issued the first part of the English volume of the *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, edited by Professor Alexander Bugge, and containing texts of English characters and records relating to the medieval intercourse between England and Norway.

A new journal which will be especially welcomed by historical students who do not read the Slavonic languages is the *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte*. It will be published quarterly by Georg Reimer of Berlin, under the editorship of Professors Theodor Schiekmann of Berlin, Otto Höttsch of Posen, Leopold Karl Goetz of Bonn, and Hans Uebersberger of Vienna. Articles in German and French will be admitted. Much effort will be made to provide Western readers, by means of translations, with knowledge of recent historical progress in the Slavonic countries.

H. Steinacker has published in *Urania* for 1909 various papers that constitute an important contribution to the history of the Eastern Question, treated as only the latest form of "das Problem des Verhältnisses zwischen Asien und Europa".

The *Revue Historique* for October contains a review by L. Brehier of the publications of the years 1907-1910 in the field of Byzantine history.

The *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XIX. 1-2, contains an address of Timur edited with notes by M. Tren. It has reference apparently to the campaign of 1391 and is found in a manuscript of the second half of the sixteenth century.

The publishing house of Charles Lavanzelle, Paris, has undertaken the publication of a translation by E. Cazalas of the Russian General Staff's History of the War of 1812. In this work six volumes are occupied with the preliminaries of 1810-1811. It may be remarked that the approach of the centenary is already stimulating publication on the war in Russia, the Imperial Historical Society having begun the publication of documents with a volume on the *Acts* of the provisional provincial governments during the French occupation (*Sbornik*, vol. CXXVIII., 1909).

Tomes V. and VI. of the fifth series of the *Publications de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes* is a posthumous work by Émile Legrand, *Bibliographie Ionienne: Description Raisonnée des Ouvrages publiés par les Grecs des Sept Îles ou concernant ces Îles du XV^e Siècle à l'Année 1900*, completed by H. Pernot (Paris, E. Leroux, 1910).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

M. Eugène Caillot's *Les Polynésiens Orientaux au Contact de la Civilisation* (Paris, E. Leroux, 1909, pp. 291, and 92 plates) consists

of two parts. The first, based on the author's observations during a long voyage in 1900, describes the manners, customs, religions, and political organization of the eastern Polynesians at that time. The second part consists of the "Book of the Commandant Supérieur aux Îles-sous-le-Vent", which the author found in the archives of Uturoa, and which is virtually an official chronicle of the insurrection in Raiatea-Tahaa, Society Islands, against the French rule, 1894-1897.

The Asiatic Society of Japan has undertaken the publication of volumes I. and III. of *A History of Japan* by Professor J. Murdoch, formerly of Aberdeen University. Volume II. (1543-1651) was published in 1903 and volume I. has just been issued (London, Kegan Paul, pp. 667). Constable and Company, London, have just published for the London School of Economics and Political Science *The Political Development of Japan, 1867-1909*, by George Etsujiro Uychara, a doctoral thesis at the University of London.

Messrs. Lippincott have brought out a *Life of the Late Empress Dowager of China* by Mr. J. O. P. Bland, who was for several years a member of the Chinese government service. The volume has been compiled from state papers and the private diary of the comptroller of the empress's household, and incorporates the diary of His Excellency Ching Shan.

John Murray, London, announces for immediate publication a new book on Indian affairs by Sir Francis Younghusband, *India and Thibet: a History of the Relations which have subsisted between the Two Countries from the Time of Warren Hastings to 1910; with a Particular Account of the Mission to Lhasa in 1904*. Sir Francis was the leader of this mission.

The Cambridge University Press has published *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, by Edward G. Browne, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, professor of Arabic.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Girard, *Les Routes de Commerce vers l'Extrême-Orient à la Fin du XVII^e et au Commencement du XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, September-October); C. O. Paullin, *The Opening of Korca by Commodore Shufeldt* (Political Science Quarterly, September).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Carnegie Institution of Washington will soon be able to issue two volumes prepared by the Department of Historical Research, Professor Fish's Roman and Italian Guide and Professor Allison's Inventory of Unpublished Materials for American Religious History. A "Calendar of Papers in Washington Archives relating to the Territories of the United States", to 1873, prepared by Mr. David W. Parker, and amount-

ing probably to four hundred pages of print, has been sent to the printer. Mr. Parker is now at Ottawa, engaged in the preparation of a "Guide to the Materials for United States History in Canadian Archives". The manuscript of Professor Bolton's Guide to such material in the Mexican archives, national and local, has been received. In January Mr. Roscoe R. Hill of Columbia University will go to Spain under the auspices of the Department for a prolonged period of work, in which the chief task will be the preparation of a calendar of the papers relating to United States history in that section of the Archives of the Indies at Seville known as "Papeles procedentes de la Isla de Cuba".

Among the recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress are: the Madison papers possessed by the Chicago Historical Society and its Polk collection, including President Polk's diary; La Harpe's Journal concerning the establishment of the French in Louisiana, being a copy made in 1764 by the Chevalier de Beaurain, with maps; twenty-three volumes and fifty-nine packages of the Pickett papers, being the official correspondence and records of the Confederate government, 1861-1865, transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury; a body of papers of William Plumer—writings, essays, letters, and notes, 1782-1838; and "A collection of Christian and brotherly advices . . . by the yearly meetings [Friends] . . . for Pennsylvania and New Jersey", of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A large number of documents have also been transferred to the library from the files of the House of Representatives. The library's calendars of the Van Buren papers and of the military correspondence of Washington are in the press.

American and English Genealogies in the Library of Congress, Preliminary Catalogue (Washington, 1910, pp. 805) has just been issued by the library. Some 3750 volumes are listed. Only genealogies published in separate form have, as a rule, been included.

The *Cyclopedia of American Government*, edited by Professors A. C. McLaughlin and A. B. Hart and published by Messrs. D. Appleton and Company, will consist of three large volumes, each of about eight hundred pages, and will include about 3000 articles, arranged in alphabetical order, some brief, some of the nature of treatises. Each important article will be accompanied with a select list of books as references. It is expected that the work will be published about January, 1912.

It is scarcely possible that such a work as Bryce's *American Commonwealth* could become in any considerable degree antiquated, yet so many changes have taken place in the United States since the revision of 1893-1895 was brought out that many facts and figures needed to be brought up to date, and certain new phenomena and phases of development called for treatment. Mr. Bryce has accordingly subjected the entire work to a thorough revision, largely by means of supplementary notes but in considerable measure by revision of the body of the text. In making

these changes the latest obtainable figures, occasionally even those of the census of 1910, have been used. Four new chapters have been added. One of these deals with the latest phase of immigration, another with the new transmarine dominions, a third discusses the more recent phases of the negro problem, and a fourth contains further observations on American universities. These new chapters are characterized by the same keenness of observation and clearness of analysis and exposition that have given to the work its high value in the literature of American political and social life. It should be added that Mr. Seth Low has also rewritten the chapter on municipal government which he contributed to the first edition.

Democracy and the Party System in the United States, by Mr. M. Ostrogorski, is an abridged version of the second or American volume of his *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, published in 1902. The present work is the result of a thorough revision and of an additional visit to the United States, and contains much new material, especially in the later chapters.

History Made Visible, a Synchronic Chart and Statistical Tables of United States History, by Mr. George E. Groscup (New York, Windsor Publishing Company, 1910), appears to be one of the best of its kind, so far as can be declared before class-room testing, and is accompanied by some ninety pages of chronological text and lists, skilfully devised, and carefully prepared by Mr. Ernest D. Lewis, instructor in history in the High School of Commerce, New York City.

Dr. Henry Barrett Learned will send to the press in March a volume entitled *The President's Cabinet*, tracing the development of that institution from its origin to the present time.

Among the forty volumes which the Immigration Commission expects to issue as it now brings its work to a close, one is entitled "A History of Earlier European Immigration to the United States"; another, "Immigration History and Legislation"; another, "Statistical History of Immigration, 1820-1910, and Distribution of Immigrants, 1850-1910"; while another will be "A Dictionary of Races or Peoples".

The Library of Congress has issued a second and enlarged edition of its *List of References on Reciprocity* (pp. 137), embodying not only the previous list bearing that title but other related lists, with the inclusion of later literature. As now issued the list comprises reciprocity in the United States (comprehensive), reciprocity with Canada and Newfoundland, reciprocity with Hawaii, reciprocity under the McKinley Act, reciprocity with Cuba, and reciprocity with Great Britain and other countries.

Mr. Theodore L. Cole of Washington has recently made photographic facsimile reprints of the *Acts of Assembly of the Province of North Carolina, Begun and held at Newbern the second day of March*

1774 (Newbern, 1774, pp. 567-612), believed to be the last legislative session of that province whose proceedings are on record, and of the *Journal of the Convention of Alabama Territory, begun July 5, 1819* (Huntsville, 1819, pp. 40), of which only three copies are known to exist. These reprints have been issued in very small editions, thirty-one copies of the former and fifty-seven of the latter.

The articles in the October number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* are of more than usual interest to teachers of history. The leading article in the issue is "New Ideas of History", by Dr. G. G. Benjamin. The December number of the *Magazine* reprints from the *Alumni Register* of November, 1907, Professor E. P. Cheyney's address, "What is History?", delivered before the graduate school of the University of Pennsylvania in October, 1907.

Mr. Victor H. Paltsits's paper, "Tragedies in New York's Public Records", appears in part (with some additions) in the July issue of the *Magazine of History*. In the issue of that periodical for September are: "The Upper Mississippi a Century Ago", by L. A. Chase; "The Birthplace of the State of New York", by Isaac N. Mills; and "An American Loyalist: Moody of New Jersey" (first paper), by M. G. Sausser.

In *The Doctrine of Non-Suability of the State in the United States* (Johns Hopkins University Studies), Dr. Karl Singewald has presented a careful study of the questions of public law involved in the doctrine of the state's immunity from suit. The opening chapters trace the doctrine as found in English law and as resting upon the federal Constitution, but the study is in the main devoted to the relation of the doctrine to suits against public officers.

The Sovereignty of the States, by Mr. Walter Neale (New York and Washington, Neale Publishing Company, 1910, pp. 143), is an oration delivered on the battle-ground of Manassas, July 21, 1910, to the survivors of the Eighth Virginia Regiment. It ranges over the whole course of United States history from the point of view of one upholding states'-rights views in an extreme form.

The Macmillan Company have lately brought out a new and greatly revised edition of the *Industrial History of the United States* by Miss Katharine Coman, professor in Wellesley College, a book first published in 1905.

The Macmillan Company have published *The Great White North: the Story of Polar Exploration from the Earliest Times to the Discovery of the Pole*, by Mrs. Helen Smith Wright.

The New York State Education Department has issued an illustrated historical account of *The American Flag*, edited by H. H. Homer.

Mrs. Alice Morse Earle's interesting work, *Two Centuries of Costume in America*, has been brought out by Macmillan in a one-volume edition which includes all the illustrations of the two-volume edition.

Houghton Mifflin Company published in November *Education in the United States*, by President Charles F. Thwing. The volume treats primarily the development of education during the last forty-five years.

Frederic J. Stimson's new work, *Popular Law-Making: a Study of the History and the Tendencies of English and American Legislation*, has been published by Scribner.

Sir Harry H. Johnston's *The Negro in the New World* has been brought out by Macmillan, and will be reviewed in an early number of this journal.

The Bureau of American Ethnology expects to issue in January the second volume of its *Handbook of American Indians*, containing the articles from N to Z.

The principal paper in the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for March is upon the early history (latter eighteenth century) of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, by Martin I. J. Griffin. The number for June presents a preliminary account (continued in the September number) of the baptismal registers of that church, and a body of interesting notes from the archiepiscopal archives of Baltimore. Among the contents of the September number are a "History of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Philadelphia, from 1845 to 1853", by Martin I. J. Griffin, an English translation of a letter of Father Gibault to George Rogers Clark, May 10, 1780, and a variety of other documentary materials.

The American Jewish Historical Society will hold its nineteenth annual meeting in Philadelphia on February 12 and 13.

A paper on the history of the Mormons was read by Professor Eduard Meyer at the session of the philosophical-historical class of the Prussian Academy on July 7, and may be found in the *Sitzungsberichte* for that date.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

It is expected that Mr. Henry Vignaud's *Nouvelles Études sur Colomb* will appear in two large volumes this winter.

A committee headed by the Mayor of Southampton is engaged in an effort to commemorate the three-hundredth anniversary of the sailing of the *Mayflower* from that place by the erection of an elaborate monument, for which American as well as English gifts are solicited. The honorary secretary of the committee is Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw. American donations may at present be sent to Mr. H. A. Cushing, secretary of the New England Society, 43 Cedar Street, New York. The balance still required is two thousand pounds.

In a pamphlet entitled *New Facts concerning John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers* (Oxford, University Press, 1910, pp. 35), Mr. Champlin Burrage has brought together some interesting facts concern-

ing a manuscript discovered by him in the Bodleian Library entitled "An answer to Robinson the Brownists arguments", and some inferences from the document, which among other facts shows that Robinson was for some time an assistant in the ministry of St. Andrew's Church in Norwich.

Mr. James Haddon, of Uniontown, Pennsylvania, whose book, *Washington's Expeditions and Braddock's Expedition*, was mentioned in these pages of the October REVIEW, comes forth with a book entitled: *The French and Indian War, or the Conflict between Two Great Nations for Supremacy in the Mississippi Valley*.

Messrs. Charles Henry Hart and Edward Biddle of Philadelphia will publish shortly *Memoirs of the Life and Works of Jean Antoine Houdon*. The work will contain thirty photogravure illustrations and be printed by the De Vinne Press in an edition of 350 copies.

In his monograph *American Commercial Legislation before 1789* (pp. 167) Dr. A. A. Giesecke has done a useful piece of work in bringing together the scattered material on the subject. The book has been brought out by the University of Pennsylvania.

It is understood that Mr. J. M. Lear of the State Normal School, Farmville, Virginia, is writing a biography of Charles Fenton Mercer (1778-1858).

A book that should possess large interest and value is the work of Professor P. J. Treat, entitled *The National Land System, 1785-1820, and the Westward Movement*, recently published by E. B. Treat and Company.

Volume IX. (December, 1813, to May, 1814) of *The Documentary History of the Campaigns upon the Niagara Frontier in 1812-1814*, collected and edited for the Lundy's Lane Historical Society by Lieutenant-Colonel E. Cruikshank, F.R.S.C. (Welland, Tribune Office, pp. 351, xxviii), although bearing the imprint date, 1908, has only recently been received. The documents include general orders, official reports, letters, extracts from newspapers, etc., and describe the various phases of the campaigns from the view-points of both sides. The materials are gathered from many printed sources and not a few manuscript collections have been drawn upon. Such a compilation is invaluable for studying the campaigns to which it relates.

The Clipper Ship Era, 1843-1869, an account of the noted clippers of the United States and Great Britain and of their owners, builders, commanders, and crews, by Arthur H. Clark, has been brought out by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Robert Hall McCormick and James Hall Shields have prepared and published in attractive form *The Life and Works of Robert McCormick, including his Invention of the Reaper*. The chief design of the authors'

labors is to support the claims in behalf of Robert McCormick for his invention of the reaper, and considerable space is devoted to the documentary evidence in the case.

Houghton Mifflin Company have brought out an edition of speeches and letters of Richard H. Dana, jr., edited with an introductory sketch and notes by Richard H. Dana, 3rd. The book bears the title *Speeches in Stirring Times and Letters to a Son*. Among the speeches that are of interest to historical students are those on the Monroe Doctrine, the fugitive slave law, and the Free Soil movement.

New volumes in Messrs. Jacobs's series of *American Crisis Biographies* are: *William H. Seward*, by Edward Everett Hale, jr., *Stephen A. Douglas*, by Henry Parker Willis, and *William Lloyd Garrison*, by Lindsay Swift.

A fifth edition, revised and enlarged, of Edwin Rossiter Johnson's *History of the War of Secession, 1861-1865*, has been brought out by Wessells and Bissell Company.

The Review of Reviews Company is issuing, in a series of ten volumes entitled *Photographic History of the Civil War*, a reproduction of a series of 3500 photographs of war-time scenes and events taken by the famous photographer Mathew B. Brady.

Rev. Dr. Randolph H. McKim of Washington, who served as a private under Stonewall Jackson, as a staff officer under General Robert E. Lee, and as a cavalry captain under General Fitz-Hugh Lee, has published through Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company *A Soldier's Recollections: Leaves from the Diary of a Young Confederate*.

Recollections of Alexander H. Stephens, by Myrta Lockett Avery, has been published by Doubleday, Page, and Company. Included in the volume is the diary kept by Stephens during his imprisonment at Fort Warren. The diary contains recollections of Stephens's early life and political career and also estimates of men and measures.

The State Company of Columbia, South Carolina, have brought out the *Memoirs of the War of Secession* prepared by the late General Johnson Hagood. The memoirs, which relate for the most part to the services of General Hagood personally and to those of his immediate associates, were written in 1871, and have been edited by U. R. Brooks. The editor's services appear to have consisted in making a list of errata, several pages in extent, after the book had come from the printers.

The *Diary of an Enlisted Man*, by Lawrence Van Alstyne (New Haven, The Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Company, pp. 348), is the record of experiences kept by a private in a New York company from August, 1862, to June, 1864, whose services were principally in Louisiana.

The Battle of the Wilderness, by Morris Schaff, which appeared in installments in the *Atlantic Monthly*, has now been published by Houghton Mifflin Company in book form.

The Origin of the National Banking System, by Andrew McFarland Davis, which has been issued by the National Monetary Commission (61 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Doc. No. 582*), is a study of the inception and growth of the idea and of the development of the measure into its final form through several years of agitation in Congress. The distinctive value of the monograph is the light thrown upon the history of the measure by the correspondence of Secretary Chase, which Mr. Davis has thoroughly examined. The attitude of the public is also brought out through newspaper comment, speeches in Congress, and other means. The full text of the act upon which the national banking system rests is given in an appendix, as is also that of the Hooper Bill, an earlier form of the measure, which failed of passage.

Mr. Alexander D. Noyes has prepared for the National Monetary Commission a brief *History of the National-Bank Currency* (61 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Doc. No. 572*, pp. 20).

The Knights of St. Crispin, 1867-1874: a Study in the Industrial Causes of Trade Unionism, by Don D. Leschoier (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, no. 355, pp. 101), forms an interesting chapter in the history of industry as well as of industrial organization in the United States. The Knights of St. Crispin were a national organization of shoemakers, and it is the conclusion of the author that they were "the first great protest of America's workingmen against the abuse of machinery".

Colonel William H. Crook's reminiscences of life in the White House from the days of Lincoln to that of Garfield have been brought out by Harper and Brothers under the title *Through Five Administrations*.

The Trade Union Label, by Dr. Ernest R. Spedden, is a recent number of the Johns Hopkins University Studies. The author has traced carefully the history of the label from its first use by the Cigar Makers' Association of the Pacific Coast in 1875. The treatment covers also the form of the label, its administration, financing, and other aspects of its use.

Mr. Theodore Stanton and Mrs. Stanton Blatch are engaged in the preparation of *The Letters of Elizabeth Cady Stanton: an Epistolary Biography*, which will be published by Putnam.

The Government Printing Office has completed the first volume of the new set of *Executive Journals of the Senate*. This set is to extend the printing of these journals over the period from 1891 to 1905 (52d-58th Congresses) and will fill at least seven volumes, numbered XXVIII. to XXXIV. The edition is of only 250 copies. The volume now finished, volume XXVIII., covers both sessions of the 52d Congress and the special session of the 53rd. The indexes, five for each session, making fifteen separate alphabets in all, fill forty per cent. of the volume.

Doubleday, Page, and Company, have issued the *Presidential Addresses and State Papers* of President Taft, March 4, 1909, to March 5, 1910.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Mr. J. M. Dent has published in *Everyman's Library* a volume entitled *The Pilgrim Fathers* (pp. xvii, 364), with a quite unsatisfactory introduction by Mr. John Masefield. It reprints (text and notes) the Congregational Board of Publication's edition of Morton's *New England's Memorial* (1855), Captain John Smith's *New England's Trials*, and Alexander Young's edition (1844) of Cushman's *Discourse*, of Winslow's *Good News from New England*, and of his brief narration appended to *Hypocrisy Unmasked*. Thus it makes good out-of-print matter accessible, with notes mostly good but sometimes antiquated.

Mr. H. M. Sylvester's *Indian Wars of New England*, in three sumptuous volumes, has just been issued by the W. B. Clarke Company. The author supplements his narrative with liberal extracts from the sources.

The Maine Historical Society has received as a gift from Mrs. Ellen S. Roach about one hundred letters written during the War of 1812 to General William King, and from Philip F. Turner, esq., a large collection of papers relating to the history of Cape Elizabeth.

Volume XV. of the *Documentary History of the State of Maine*, published by the Maine Historical Society (Portland, Lefavor-Tower Company, 1910, pp. xviii, 478) and edited by Mr. James Phinney Baxter, consists of documents relating to Maine in the Revolution—1777 and the first four months of 1778. Their source or the present location of the originals is nowhere indicated. Apparently they come from the Council records of Massachusetts. The military events recorded are of slight importance—British descents on Machias, Wiscasset, and the like—but the life of the period, so far as the war affected it, is portrayed in detail.

Volume XXX. of the *New Hampshire State Papers* is preceded by an introduction giving an account of the Revolutionary archives of New Hampshire, written by the editor, Dr. Albert S. Batchellor.

The Prince Society has issued the first volume of *Colonial Currency Reprints* edited by Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis. The series will embrace all the known tracts on currency which appeared in Massachusetts from 1682 to 1751, fifty-eight in number. Sixteen of these, running to 1721, are printed in the present volume, with elaborate notes by an editor whose erudition in this field is well known.

The *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* for April, 1910 (new series, vol. XX., pt. 2), contain a body of letters illustrating life at Harvard College a century ago, from the papers of Stephen Salisbury

of the class of 1817; an article by Mr. F. W. Hodge on the Jumano Indians and the identification of them with a branch of the Wichitas; and a careful account, with lists, of the libraries of the Mathers, by Mr. Julius H. Tuttle.

The new building of the American Antiquarian Society is now completed and occupied. Its volumes of Royal Proclamations respecting America, which the librarian, Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, has been editing, are ready for issue. The New England Historic Genealogical Society has deposited its large collection of maps in this new building at Worcester.

The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America intends to publish two volumes of the Correspondence of Governor William Shirley of Massachusetts, in similar form to that of Miss Kimball's *Correspondence of William Pitt*. The editor of the volumes, Dr. Charles H. Lincoln of 22 Dean street, Worcester, Massachusetts, would be glad to be informed of letters written by or to Shirley, that might otherwise escape his knowledge.

The *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society for October, 1909, to June, 1910 (volume XLIII.), appears just as this journal goes to press. The *Proceedings* for October, 1910, consist mainly of a paper by Mr. Charles Francis Adams on the American campaign of 1777.

The *Massachusetts Magazine* proposes to publish a number of articles on the great historical libraries of Massachusetts and inaugurates the series with an account of the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society, by A. W. Dennis. The article includes a list of some of the more notable unpublished groups of papers in the society's collections.

Any clue to unpublished material by or relating to Harrison Gray Otis (1765-1848) will be gratefully received by Mr. S. E. Morison, 8 Otis Place, Boston, who is preparing a biography on that subject.

An interesting volume on *Boston Common* richly illustrated has been privately printed at the Merrymount Press by Mr. M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

A *Historical Sketch of the First Congregational Church, Sturbridge, Massachusetts*, by Professor George H. Haynes (Worcester, 1910), a pamphlet of sixty-eight pages, is distinguished from the run of such discourses by the superior intelligence with which the history of the church is studied and by the manner in which the preservation of certain unusual records makes possible the illustration of the social and mental life of the church.

The Rhode Island Historical Society has come into possession of the papers of John Howland (1757-1854) who was for many years president of the society and was especially interested in the history of the Plymouth Colony.

The first number (January, 1911) of *The New Netherland Register*, edited and published by Dingman Versteeg of 99 Nassau street, New York, has appeared. This number contains sixteen pages, occupied principally with sketches of some New Netherland pioneers. The *Register* is to be published monthly.

The *Rough List of Manuscripts in the Library of the Buffalo Historical Society*, which was printed in volume XIV. of the society's *Publications*, has been issued as a separate.

The September number of *Old^e Ulster* contains an article on Slavery in Ulster County.

The Free Public Library of Jersey City has issued an historical souvenir of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Bergen, observed during the week of October 16 to 23, 1910. The souvenir bears the title *Bergen and Jersey City* (pp. 36), is illustrated, and contains an outline of the history of the two cities, and a chapter on manners and customs of the time prior to the Revolution.

The pages of the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are occupied principally with the record of the formal opening (April 6 and 7) of the society's new building. Of chief interest among the addresses delivered on the occasion may be mentioned that of Hon. S. W. Pennypacker, who recounted the history of the society, and that of Mr. Charles Francis Adams, who spoke in favor of "a wiser discrimination and a more scientific differentiation" on the part of historical societies in the preservation of historical materials.

The *Acts and Proceedings* of the fifth annual meeting (January 6, 1910) of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies contains a useful conspectus of the work done by the several historical societies of the state during the preceding year.

Hon. Samuel W. Pennypacker has brought out through William J. Campbell of Philadelphia a collection of his special studies in Pennsylvania history bearing the title: *Pennsylvania in American History*. The principal of these studies deal with subjects of the Revolution and the Civil War.

Under the caption "Causes of Migration to America" the *Pennsylvania German* prints in its September issue a collection of extracts from various writers bearing especially upon the earlier German migrations. In Mr. C. H. Williston's series, "Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania", the paper in the September number is on Tadeuskund, that in the October number on Tammany.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have published *The Wilderness Trail*, in two volumes, by Charles A. Hanna. On the title page appears also the following: "The Ventures and Adventures of the Pennsylvania Traders on the Alleghany Path, with some New Annals of the Old West, and the Records of some Strong Men and some Scoundrels". It is understood

that the author has made use of considerable material hitherto unpublished and has thrown new light on some phases of Indian activities connected with the French and Indian War.

Much of the contents of the September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* relate to the Revolutionary War. There is a series of letters from Lieutenant-Colonel Samuel Smith to General Washington (September to November, 1777) describing the defense of Fort Mifflin; an extract from the journal of Baron de Cloisen (from the Rochambeau Papers in the Library of Congress) relating to the movement of French troops in Maryland in the summer of 1782; some documents found among the British archives which relate to the burning of the *Peggy Stewart*, and finally there is a group of letters (1777-1779) to the governor of Maryland from executives of other states.

Among the numerous documents which are printed in the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* the following may be mentioned as possessing special interest: a letter of Ralph Wormely, jr., April 4, 1776, to John Grymes, who was serving under Lord Dunmore—a letter which aroused suspicion as to his attachment to the American cause; documents in the case of Matthew Phripp, charged with disloyalty (1775); a proclamation of Richard Henderson and company calling a convention at Harrodsburg in 1775; a contract between the proprietors and the people of Transylvania (1775); an ordinance for a general test proposed in the Virginia convention in August, 1775; and a number of items (minutes of the Council for Foreign Plantations, orders of the king and council, etc.) pertaining to the government of Virginia, 1662-1665. The principal items of the Randolph manuscript relate to Lord Culpepper's administration (1682-1683).

The William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine for October contains an article on "The Use and Abuse of Forests by the Virginia Indians" by Hu Maxwell. The writer has drawn his materials from many sources.

Professor James Mercer Garnett of Baltimore has printed in a pamphlet of sixty-two pages a *Biographical Sketch of Hon. James Mercer Garnett of Elmwood, Essex County, Virginia*, with a genealogy of the Mercer-Garnett and Mercer families.

The Historical Commission of the State of North Carolina has decided to print the German version of Christoph von Graffenried's account of his American adventures, to be edited by Professor Julius Goebel of the University of Illinois. This version is more interesting and valuable than the French version hitherto known. The differences between the two will be noted, and the drawings, maps, etc., will be reproduced from the original manuscript.

The addresses delivered at the unveiling of the bust of William A. Graham in Raleigh on January 12, 1910, have been brought out by the

North Carolina Historical Commission as bulletin no. 7 of the commission's *Publications*. The principal address was by Mr. Frank Nash, upon the life and services of William A. Graham. As bulletin no. 8 the commission has issued a documentary history of *Canova's Statue of Washington* (pp. 96), with an introduction by Mr. R. D. W. Connor. The statue was ordered by the state of North Carolina in 1815, set up in 1821, but destroyed by the burning of the state house in 1831. The presentation to the state by the Italian government of a plaster replica of the original model furnishes the occasion of this history.

The Trinity College Historical Society, of Durham, North Carolina, has inaugurated a series called *The John Lawson Monographs*, distinct from the society's *Annual Publication of Historical Papers*. The first of these monographs to be issued is *The Autobiography of Brantley York* (pp. xv, 139), for which Mr. E. C. Brooks writes an introduction. Brantley York was an itinerant teacher and preacher whose life stretched well across the nineteenth century (1805-1891) and whose labors extended throughout the state of North Carolina and beyond, and the story of his life, told in simple fashion by himself, throws a good deal of light on social and religious conditions in the state.

The South Carolina Historical Commission has published a volume of *Warrants of Lands in South Carolina, 1672-1679* (Columbia, 1910, pp. 222), edited by Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., secretary of the commission.

Beginning in January of the present year Dr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History of the state of Alabama, will issue a quarterly periodical devoted to Alabama history and called the *Alabama History Journal*. Articles, original documents, reviews of books, and news will be included in the journal's contents.

The library of Yale University has recently come into possession of the manuscript journal of an expedition into the Southwest by Henry L. Ellsworth. It is dated from Fort Gibson, November 17, 1832, covers 116 foolscap pages, and has much material respecting the manners and customs of the Indian tribes.

Mr. E. S. Miller contributes to the July issue of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* a paper on "The State Finances of Texas during the Civil War", and to the October issue a similar paper dealing with the period of Reconstruction. Of especial interest are two documentary publications. In the July number are printed "The Reminiscences of Henry Smith", written as a letter to M. B. Lamar (November 18, 1836), when Smith was secretary of the treasury of the Republic of Texas. The document is among the Lamar papers in the Texas State Library. The other document, printed in the October number, is a part of a memorial presented by Major John Tyler, in October, 1863, to the governor and authorities of Texas, appealing to them to take the initiative in demanding protection of France on the basis of the guarantees ir

the Louisiana Purchase Treaty. Mr. C. W. Ramsdell writes an introduction to the memorial, discussing its possible origins.

The Territorial Governors of the Old Northwest, by Dwight G. McCarty, a recent issue of the Torch Press, includes accounts of some of the early governors of the territories of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for October prints some letters of political interest (1866-1867) from R. P. L. Baber to Senator James R. Doolittle, with a biographical sketch of Baber, by Duane Mowry, and an account of "Bowman's Expedition against Chilli-cothe, May-June, 1779", from the Draper manuscripts. There is also a paper on "La Salle's Route down the Ohio", by E. L. Taylor, and an address, "Significance of Perry's Victory", by I. J. Cox.

The papers of Governor Allen Trimble and of his granddaughter Mrs. Thompson, brought together and arranged by Mrs. Mary McArthur Tuttle of Hillsborough, Ohio, have been transferred to the custody of the Western Reserve Historical Society at Cleveland.

A brief paper concerning the public documents of Indiana, by John A. Lapp, legislative reference librarian of the state library, appears in the September issue of the *Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History*.

Professor C. M. Alvord contributes to the October number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* a number of letters written by Edward Cole, Indian commissioner in the Illinois Country, 1766-1769. The letters are to Sir William Johnson and to George Croghan, and are drawn from the Sir William Johnson manuscripts in the New York State Library. Another item of some interest is an autobiographical letter of Edward Coles, governor of Illinois from 1823 to 1826, written to W. C. Flagg in 1861.

The *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* for September publishes an interesting letter concerning Kentucky written by Otto, the French chargé d'affaires, to Count Vergennes, dated March 11, 1786. The letter is printed in an English translation made for the *Register* by Mr. Waldo G. Leland. The omission of French accents is perhaps pardonable if the printing office does not possess French type, but the title-page prefixed to the letter contains several other errors that are not so easily excused. To the same number of the *Register* Miss Martha Stephenson contributes a first paper upon "Education in Harrodsburg and Neighborhood since 1775", and Mrs. Elizabeth Snow Sturges some "Recollections of Louis Kossuth in Washington".

Kentucky: Mother of Governors, by John Wilson Townsend (Frankfort, The Kentucky State Historical Society, pp. 50), gives brief sketches of those Kentuckians, native, adopted, "sojourner", and a few others, who have been governors of any of the states or territories. Missouri

heads the list with ten natives to her credit (to leave uncounted the adopted and the sojourners) and Illinois comes next with seven.

The Prehistoric Men of Kentucky, by Bennett H. Young (Louisville, Morton), is the latest of the Filson Club Publications.

The Burton Library of Detroit, Michigan, has come into possession of the papers of Alpheus S. Felch, commissioner of banking in Michigan in the days of the "wild cat" banks, governor of the state, 1846-1847, and United States senator, 1847-1853.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has acquired the valuable manuscript collections of the late George H. Paul of Milwaukee. It has also come into possession of the site of the old Black Hawk War fort at Blue Mound.

Volume XIX. of the *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (pp. xxii, 528), edited by Dr. Reuben Gold Thwaites, comprises the following groups of documents: Mackinac Register of Baptisms and Interments, 1695-1821; A Wisconsin Fur-Trader's Journal, 1804-1805; The Fur-Trade on the Upper Lakes, 1778-1815; and The Fur-Trade in Wisconsin, 1815-1817. The fur-trader's journal kept by François Victor Malhiot, a clerk in the service of the North-West Fur Company at Lac du Flambeau, gives an insight into the rude life of the region and also into the methods employed in the fur-trade. This and the Mackinac register occupy about half the volume. The documents which occupy the remainder of the volume consist for the most part of official, business, and friendly letters which relate primarily to the fur-trade or throw light upon it. After 1815 the United States government, through its relation to the Indians, plays an important part in the business. The letters which are not in the possession of the society are drawn mainly from the federal archives and from the library of Mr. C. M. Burton of Detroit. Dr. Thwaites has edited the material with his usual thoroughness.

The principal article in the October number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* is a history of "The County Judge System of Iowa with Special Reference to its Workings in Pottawattamie County", by N. A. Crawford, jr. The system as it existed in Iowa from 1851 to 1861 was anomalous among American institutions. A brief paper on "The Scope of Iowa History" is contributed by Louis Pelzer.

The Missouri Historical Society has recently acquired several valuable files of Missouri newspapers, principal among which is the *Liberty Tribune* of Clay County, Missouri, 1846-1885. Among the manuscript acquisitions of the society are letters from members of the Doniphan expedition and from the California gold seekers in 1849.

The Nebraska State Historical Society has just issued an *Outline of Nebraska History*, edited by Mr. Albert Watkins, in which events of the history of the state are set forth in methodical order under

subheadings, accompanied by references to books and records forming the only comprehensive bibliography of Nebraska history yet published.

The Torch Press announces for publication early in 1911 *Leading Facts in New Mexican History*, by Ralph E. Twitchell, author of *The Military Occupation of New Mexico*. The work will be in two volumes and will bring the treatment down practically to the present time.

Professor F. G. Young's third paper on "The Financial History of Oregon", which appears in the June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, relates to the sale of Oregon lands. T. C. Elliott contributes to this number additional portions of the journal of Peter Skene Ogden on the Snake Expedition of 1826-1827; John Minto writes "What I know of Dr. McLoughlin and how I know it"; and B. F. Manring records "Recollections of a Pioneer of 1859", the pioneer being, not Mr. Manring, but Lawson Stockman.

In a volume entitled *Heroes of California*, which Little, Brown, and Company have published, Mr. George Wharton James has made the founders of the state tell their own stories as far as possible.

Messrs. Wrong and Langton's *Review of Historical Publications relating to Canada*, volume XIV. (Toronto, University Press, 1910, pp. xii, 209), covers the publications of the year 1909 with the same fullness, care, and discrimination in judging which have characterized its predecessors.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cruikshank's *Inventory of the Military Documents in the Canadian Archives* (Publications of the Canadian Archives, no. 2, Ottawa, 1910, pp. 370), referred to in our last issue, has now appeared. It presents statements, generally varying from four to ten lines in length, of the contents of 1847 volumes and 350 portfolios of papers belonging to the series called "C", together with a full index. Series C embraces letters and despatches, with their various enclosures, which accumulated in the office of the Military Secretary to the Commander of the Forces in Canada from 1786 to 1873, the letter books of that official and his chief from 1795 to 1870, his general order books from 1811 to 1870, and less complete sets of the letter books of other military officials. Its value to United States history is in certain parts considerable.

We have received volumes I. and II. of the *Papers and Records* of the Lenox and Addington Historical Society. The society is located at Napanee, Ontario, and derives its name from two counties of the province. The first volume includes some chronicles of Napanee, written in 1873 and 1874, an account of the origin of some of the local names of the region, by W. S. Herrington, notes of early ecclesiastical history of the Bay of Quinte district, contributed by Rev. Canon Jarvis, and a description of amusements among the early settlers, by C. M. Warner. The second volume includes, besides some articles of local

interest, a paper on early education in the province, by Frederick Burrows. It is a misfortune that in the indexes the names are not arranged in precise alphabetical order.

Three Premiers of Nova Scotia, by Dr. Edward M. Saunders (Toronto, Briggs, 1909, pp. 628), and Mr. Joseph A. Chisholm's edition of the *Speeches and Public Letters of Joseph Howe* (Halifax, Chronicle Publishing Company, 1909, two volumes, pp. 668, 680), are important contributions to much more than the history of Nova Scotia. J. W. Johnstone, Howe, and Tupper, the three premiers of Dr. Saunders's book, were statesmen of great influence on the development of the Dominion in general.

Bermuda, Past and Present: a Descriptive and Historical Account of the Somers Islands, by W. B. Hayward, has been brought out by Dodd, Mead, and Company.

The volume by General Weyler referred to in our last issue is one of five entitled *Mi Mando en Cuba (10 Febrero 1896 á 31 Octubre 1897): Historia Militar y Política de la Última Guerra Separatista durante dicho Mando*, published by Felipe G. Rojas, Madrid. A second volume has now appeared.

Volume XXVI. of Señor Genaro García's *Documentos Inéditos ó muy Raros para la Historia de México* contained a body of documents on the revolution following the Plan of Ayutla, drawn from the archives of General Manuel Doblado. Volume XXXI. (Mexico, Bouret, 1910, pp. 265) continues this material by the printing of 123 letters, of dates running from the end of November, 1855, to the end of July, 1866. The volume is entitled *Los Gobiernos de Alvarez y Comonfort*, and furnishes a vivid picture not only of Doblado's striking character but of the political complications called into existence by the Conservatives in their struggle against ecclesiastical and social reform.

In the "School of Higher Studies" of the National University of Mexico, recently founded, authoritative professors are being engaged to reside at the City of Mexico for three months each year during their terms of office and to lecture to students whose qualifications are graduation from a university school (college) and high honors in subjects related to that to be pursued. It is expected that these professors will devote these courses to research as well as to instruction. Among those already appointed are Professors Baldwin (Baltimore, philosophy and social science), Boas (New York, anthropology), Capitan (Paris, ethnology), and Rowe (Philadelphia, political science). A professor of history is soon to be appointed.

Señor José Toribio Medina of Santiago de Chile, the eminent bibliographer, has just published *La Imprenta en Guatemala, 1660-1821*, a large volume of more than seven hundred pages, containing 2642 titles extending from the beginning of printing in that city.

An Academy of the History of Cuba has been created at Havana by decree of August 20, 1910. Composed of thirty members appointed by the government, this academy will deal with the general interests of Cuban history and will publish a review.

Dr. Georg Friederici, whose scholarly researches into Indian customs, in particular his *Skalpieren und Ähnliche Kriegsgebräuche in America* (1906) and *Die Schiffahrt der Indianer* (1907), have received high commendation, has brought out a brochure upon *Die Amazonen Amerikas* (Leipzig, Simmel, pp. 23). The author has for years been gathering materials upon this subject; the aim in this pamphlet is to point out the many-sided character of the Amazon legends and to maintain (in opposition to the recent contention of Lasch) that the Amazons must not be relegated to the domain of myth.

Señor Rafael M. de Labra's *Orientación Americana de España* (Madrid, 1910) is the second part of the author's work, *La Orientación Internacional de España*, and aims in particular to emphasize the spiritual influence of Spain in America.

The third triennial volume of *Los Pueblos Hispanoamericanos en el Siglo XX.*, prepared by Ricardo Beltrán y Rózpide, has been issued in Madrid. The volume comprises a summary of events, chiefly political and economic, in the several Spanish-American countries during the years 1907-1909. The intervention of the United States in Cuba receives extensive treatment, as do also Panama, the interoceanic canal, and Central American affairs. There is a separate chapter on the international life of Spanish America.

The Hakluyt Society will shortly issue a volume of the correspondence of Storm van 's Gravesande, an important governor of Dutch Guiana, 1743-1772, edited by Messrs. J. A. J. de Villiers of the British Museum and C. A. Harris of the Colonial Office. Governor Storm's papers were, it may be remembered, of much significance in the discussion of the Guiana-Venezuela and Guiana-Brazil boundaries.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Pietschmann, *Bericht des Diego Rodriguez de Figueroa über seine Verhandlungen mit dem Inka Titu Cusi Yupanqui in den Anden von Vilcapampa* (Nachrichten von der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1910, 2); Henry Vignaud, *L'Ancienne et la Nouvelle Campagne pour la Canonisation de Christophe Colomb* (Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris, VI.); Julius Goebel, *Die Gründung von Neu-Bern in Nord-Carolina* (Internationale Wochenschrift, October 1); L.-A. Prud-homme, *Le Nord-Ouest Canadien après la Conquête, 1760-1784* (Revue Canadienne, September-November); Mme. B. Van Vorst, *L'Amérique au XVIII^e Siècle, d'après un Voyageur Français* (Revue des Deux Mondes, November); Halvdan Koht, *The Genesis of American Independence* (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandling,

1910, 3); J. E. Dow, *Some Passages in the Life of Commodore John Barry* (American Catholic Historical Researches, October); Henry G. Ellis, *The Influence of Industrial and Educational Leaders on the Secession of Virginia* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Gideon Welles, *Diary of the Reconstruction Period*, IX., X., XI. (Atlantic Monthly, October, November, December); Walter L. Fleming, *General William T. Sherman as a History Teacher* (Educational Review, October); Brigadier-General Frederick Funston, *To Cuba as a Freebooter; Cas-cowa, the first Cuban Siege; The Fall of Guaimaro; A Defeat and a Victory* (Scribner's Magazine, September, October, November, December).